9

done

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

INTERPRETED IN ITS RELATION TO CONTEMPORANEOUS RELIGIOUS CURRENTS IN PALESTINE AND THE HELLENISTIC-ORIENTAL WORLD

BY

HUGO ODEBERG
B. D., Ph. D.
Appointed Lecturer in Exegesis in the University of Upsala

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
15,001
BS
2615
.03

UPPSALA OCH STOCKHOLM
ALMQVIST & WIKSELLS BOKTRYCKERI-A.-B.
(I DISTRIBUTION)

Kr.
+ . KT
EO

UPPSALA 1929
ALMQVIST & WIKSELLS BOKTRYCKERI-A.-B.
27451

PRINTED IN SWEDEN.

To

The Most Rev. the Archbishop of Sweden

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM

Ph. D., LL. D., D. C. L., M. D., D. Lit., Th. D., D. D.

this book is dedicated
as a humble token of
gratitude

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/fourthgospelinte0000hugo

PART I

THE DISCOURSES
OF
JOHN 1 19—12

CONTENTS

Preface . . . 5
Sources and Literature . . . 7
Abbreviations . . . 32
Jn 1 51 . . . 33
» 2 25 . . . 43
» 3 5 ff . . . 48
» 3 13 . . . 72
» 3 14 f . . . 99
» 3 16—21 . . . 113
» 4 7—15 . . . 149
» 4 20—26 . . . 169
» 4 4—26 . . . 173
» 4 32, 34 . . . 187
» 5 19—29 . . . 190
» 5 30—47 . . . 217
» 6 26—71 . . . 235
» 7 3—8 . . . 270
» 7 14—39 . . . 281
» 8 12—29 . . . 286
» 8 30—59 . . . 296
» 9 4, 5, 39—41 . . . 310
» 10 1—18 . . . 313
» 10 25—38 . . . 330
» 11 9, 10 . . . 333
» 11 25, 26 . . . 333
» 11 41, 42 . . . 334
» 12 23—36 . . . 334
» 12 44—50 . . . 335

PREFACE.

The undertaking of the present investigation was suggested to the writer by his teacher, The Rev. Canon G. H. Box, D. D., Professor of Old Testament Studies in the University of London. It has also fallen in with his own inclinations.

The subject has been approached by the writer from an angle somewhat different from the usual. During his studies in early Jewish mysticism the writer found a strangely close correspondence between the Jewish mystical sources and certain strata of the Mandæan literature, a correspondence that was not restricted to similarity of ideas but included identity of technical terms and expressions. Whereas the early Jewish mysticism, of course, lives within the environment of Rabbinical Judaism, and uses the language and general phraseology of the latter, with respect to central or constitutive tenets again, it was found to stand on one side with Mandæism as against Rabbinism. To the writer it was obvious that Reitzenstein and Lidzbarski have been right in maintaining a Palestinian or near-Palestinian origin of Mandæism.

The case with the Fourth Gospel seemed to the writer to be the same, *mutatis mutandis,* as with early Jewish mysticism. On the one hand one detects, already at a superficial reading, passages, sentences and words revealing a terminology all but identical with the Rabbinic, on the other hand the import of the Jn-ine utterances thus expressed in the 'Rabbinic' terminology puts us in touch with a sphere of conceptions and ideas wholly removed from Rabbinic ones.

In his article '*The Jewish Environments of Early Christianity*' Professor Box, from his intimate and independent knowledge of Rabbinical literature in all its phases, suggested that the way to find a solution of the problems connected with the ideas and literary documents of early Christianity could only be found through recognizing that Rabbinism was not the exclusively aud totally dominant religious sphere of the Jews of Palestine of the first centuries of our era, and hence, that early Christianity should be viewed in relation not only to Rabbinical theology, but also to the many different religious currents by the side of Rabbinism. There should scarcely be any doubt but that the present trend of studies, at least of the Fourth Gospel, steadily moves in the direction of the principles laid down by Professor Box. As a fait accompli one may already behold the complete transference from West-Hellenistic to Oriental environment of the comparative studies with regard to the Fourth Gospel.

The modern writers, with whom, next to his teacher Professor Box, the author finds himself intrinsically best in accord, would perhaps be Professor Gerhard Kittel, on one hand[1], and Professor H. H. Schæder, in view of the position and method of investigation which the latter adopts in his study *Der Mensch im Prolog des IV. Evangeliums*[2], on the other. The author has besides derived especial profit from Merx, Grill, Burney, Vacher Burch, Büchsel, Lagrange, Nolloth and Archbishop Bernard.

The present study will be followed by (1) a study of Jn 13—20 (2) an investigation of the narrative portions of John and of the Prologue and Epilogue.

---

[1] In *Iranische Lehren* in R. Reitzenstein und H. H. Schæder, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Greichenland.*

[2] *Die Probleme des pal. Spätjudentums* etc.

Hugo Odeberg.

Björklinge, Sweden, 1929.

Sources and Literature.

A. New Testament Text.

Editions of Greek New Testament by Eberhard Nestle-Erwin Nestle, 13th edition, von Soden, and A. Souter.

The Four Gospels in Syriac Transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest by R. L. Bensly, J. Rendel Harris and F. C. Burkitt with an *Introduction* by Agnes Smith Lewis. Cambridge 1894.

The Old Syriac Gospels or Evangelion da-Mepharreshê edited by Agnes Smith Lewis. London 1910.

Evangelion da-Mepharresche, the Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, edited, collected and arranged by F. C. Burkitt, vol. I *Text,* vol. II *Introduction and Notes.* Cambridge 1904.

B. New Testament Apocrypha.

Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum, ed. A. Hilgenfeld, 4 voll. 1866 (3rd ed.), 1876—1884.

Evangelia Apocrypha^{2}, ed. C. Tischendorf 1876.

Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, ed. R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, I 1891, II$_{1}$ 1898, II$_{2}$ 1903.

Zahn, Th., *Acta Ioannis.* Erlangen 1880.

Wright, W., *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* (in Syriac) 2 vol.

Thilo, J. C., *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti.* Leipzig 1832.

Budge, E. W., *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (ed. and transl.). London 1913.

Clementine *Homilies*, ed. Lagarde 1865.

Bigg, C., *The Clementine Homilies (Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* ii pp. 157—193). Oxford 1890.

Clementine *Recognitions,* ed. Gersdorf 1838.

James, M. R., *The Apocryphal New Testament being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses with other*

Narrations and Fragments, newly translated. Oxford 1924 (2nd impression 1926). (Cited as M. R. James, *NT Apocr.*)

Hennecke, Edgar, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, In Verbindung mit Fachgelehrten in deutscher Uebersetzung und mit Einleitung—herausgegeben.*[2] Tübingen 1924.

C. Apostolic Fathers.

Patrum Apostolicorum Opera[6], recensuerunt O. Gebhardt, Ad. Harnack, Th. Zahn (editio minor).

D. Patristic Texts.

In general from 'Migne'.

Further: Rauschen, Ger., *Florilegium Patristicum.* Fasc. 2. *S. Iustini Apologiæ Duæ*[2]. Bonn 1911.

E. Gnostic (excluding Mandæan) Sources.

Apocryphal Acts *vide* above under *B*.

Preuschen, Erwin, *Zwei Gnostische Hymnen ausgelegt ... mit Text und Uebersetzung.* Giessen 1904.

Hippolytus, ΕΛΕΓΧΟΣ (cited Hippol. *Refut.*), ed. L. Duncker et T. S. Schneidewin, Göttingen 1859. ed. P. Wendland (*Hippolytus Werke,* III) Leipzig 1916.

F. Legge, *Philosophumena or the Refutation of all Heresies, Formerly Attributed to Origen, but Now to Hippolytus, Bishop and Martyr who Flourished about 220 A. D. Translated from the Text of Cruice* by F. Legge. (*Translations of Christian Literature,* Ser. I.) London 1921.

Pistis Sophia, neu herausgegeben mit Einleitung nebst Griechischem und Koptischem Wort- und Namenregister, von D. Dr Carl Schmidt. (*Coptica Consilio et Impensis Instituti Rask-Oerstediani Edita,* II.) København 1925.

Schmidt, C., *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften, Erster Band: Die Pistis Sophia—Die Beiden Bücher des Jeû—Unbekanntes Altgnostisches Werk* (*Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte,* herausgeg. von der Kirchenväter-Commission der königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften). Leipzig 1905.

——, *Pistis Sophia, Ein gnostisches Originalwerk des dritten Jahrhunderts aus dem Koptischen übersetzt, In neuer Bearbeitung mit einleitenden Untersuchungen und Indices.* Leipzig 1925.

Horner, G., *Pistis Sophia, Literally Translated from the Coptic.* London 1924.

Odes of Solomon. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon, Re-edited for the Governors of the John Ryland Library* by E. Rendel Harris and Alphonse Mingana, vol. I *Text,* vol. II *The Translation with Introduction and Notes.* Manchester 1920 (cited: *Od. Sol.*).

Bernhard, J. H., *The Odes of Solomon* (*Texts and Studies* iii 3). Cambridge 1912.

F. Mandæan Sources.

Petermann, H., *Thesaurus s. Liber magnus vulgo Liber Adami Appellatus opus Mandæorum summi ponderis,* descripsit et edidit. 2 tom. Leipzig 1867.

Lidzbarski, M., *Der Ginza oder der grosse Schatz der Mandäer, übersetzt.* Göttingen 1925.

Euting, J., *Qolasta.* Leipzig 1867.

Lidzbarski, M., *Mandäische Liturgien mitgeteilt, übersetzt und erklärt.* (*Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Neue Folge,* Bd xvii, 1.) Berlin 1920.

Lidzbarski, M., *Das mandäische Johannesbuch,* I *Text,* II *Uebersetzung.* Giessen 1915.

Note. The Mandæan sources are cited as follows:

1) *Ginza: Ginzā Yamina* as *GR* (= Ginza Right)
Ginzā S^{e}*mālā* as *GL* (= Ginza Left).

Number of tractate (book) and section of tractate are indicated by Roman and Arabic ciphers in italics; page and line in Lidzbarski's translation follow after number of tractate and section; page and line in Petermann's text, preceded by '*Pet.*' are put within brackets.

Thus, *GL I2* 437$^{21\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* 19$^{1\text{ f.}}$) means: *Ginza S*^{e}*mālā*, First Book, second section, page 437 lines 21 f. in Lidzbarski's translation, page 19 line 1 f. in Petermann's edition.

2) *Mandæan Liturgies: MLi,* followed by *Qolasta* or *Oxf.* (= Oxford Liturgies) as the case may be, the number of book and liturgical piece in italics, and page and line in Lidzbarski's text.

3) *Mandæan Book of John (D*^{e}*rāšā d*^{e}*Yaḥyā): M Joh,* followed by number of chapter, and page and line in Lidzbarski's text.

The Mandæan script of Petermann's *Thesaurus* and Lidzbarski's *M Joh* has all through been transcribed in Hebrew square characters, with the use of the additional ח̄ and ד̄ (= Nöldeke's ד̂).

G. Hermetic writings (cited *Corp. Herm.*).

Scott, W., *Hermetica, The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus,* 3 voll. Oxford 1924, 1925, 1926.

Patritius, F., *Nova de Universis Philosophia.* Ven. 1593.

Reitzenstein, R., *Poimandres.* Leipzig 1904.

***H.* Samaritan Sources.**

von Gall, August, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner.* Giessen 1914—18.

Heidenheim, M., *Bibliotheca Samaritana:*

I. *Die Samaritanische Pentateuch-Version.* Leipzig 1884.

II. *Die Samaritanische Liturgie.* Leipzig 1885.

III. *Der Commentar Marqah's des Samaritaners.* Weimar 1896 (the last-named cited *Asfar Feliata*).

Gaster, Moses, *The Asatir, The Samaritan Book of the »Secrets of Moses» together with the Pitron or Samaritan Commentary and the Samaritan Story of the Death of Moses. Published for the First time with Introduction, Translation and Notes.* London 1927.

***I.* Jewish Sources.**

1) *O. T. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.*

Ben Sira.

Box and Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (in Charles, R. H., *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*).

Smend, R., *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach Hebräisch und Deutsch.* Berlin 1906.

——, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt.* Berlin 1906.

Schechter, S., *The Hebrew Parts of the Book of Ben Sira.*

Wisdom of Solomon (in Charles, R. H., *Apoc. and Pseudep.*).

1 Enoch.

Charles, R. H., *The Book of Enoch* (Ethiopic Text). Oxford 1893.

——, *The Book of Enoch*². Oxford 1912.

Hemming, J., and Radermacher, L., *Das Buch Henoch.* Leipzig 1907.

2 Enoch.

Charles, R. H., *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch.* Oxford 1896.

Charles, R. H., and Forbes, N., *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (in Charles, R. H., *Apoc. and Pseudep. of the Old Testament,* II, pp. 431—469).

Bonwetsch, G. N., *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs. Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch.* (*Texte u. Untersuchungen,* 44, 2.) Leipzig 1922.

Test. XII Patr.

Charles, R. H., *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.* Oxford 1908.

Jubilees.

Charles, R. H., *The Book of Jubilees,* Oxford 1908.

Psalms of Solomon.

Ed. R. Harris (*vide* above under ***E***).

Fragments of a Zadokite Work (»Damaskusschrift»),

Schechter, S., *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, I. *Fragments of a Zadokite Work.* Cambridge 1910 (cited: *Zad. Fragm.*).

Assumption of Moses.

Charles, R. H., *The Assumption of Moses.* Oxford 1892.

Ferrar, W. J., *The Assumption of Moses* (Oesterley and Box, *Translations of Early Documents*). London 1918.

Apocalypse of Baruch.

Charles, R. H., *The Apocalypse of Baruch.* Oxford 1896.

Ezra-Apocalypse.

Box, G. H., *The Ezra-Apocalypse.* London 1912.

Apocalypse of Abraham.

Box, G. H., *The Apocalypse of Abraham (Translations of Early Documents).* London 1919.

Ascension of Isaiah.

Charles, R. H., *The Ascension of Isaiah (Translations of Early Documents).* London 1919.

Testament of Abraham.

Box, G. H., *The Testament of Abraham. With an Appendix containing a Translation from the Coptic Version of The Testaments of Isaac and Jacob* by S. Gaselee. (*Translations of Early Documents).* London 1927.

Testament of Solomon.

Mc Cown, Chester Charlton, *The Testament of Solomon, Edited from Manuscripts at Mount Athos, Bologna, Holkham Hall, Jerusalem, London, Milan, Paris and Vienna, with Introduction.* (*Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament,* herausgegeben von H. Windisch, Heft. 9). Leipzig 1922.

2) Philon, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quæ Supersunt,* edd. L. Cohn, P. Wendland. Berlin. I 1896, II 1897, III 1898, IV 1902, V 1906, VI (coëd. S. Reiter) 1915, VII (*Indices*, comp. I. Leisegang) 1926—.

The Works of Philo Judæus, the Contemporary of Josephus, Translated from the Greek, by C. D. Yonge, 4 voll. *(Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library).* London 1854—55.

3) *Rabbinical Literature.*

a) Talmud *(Mišnā* and *G^emārā; Tōsæftā).*

Mišna. *(M)* (in the present book always quoted from 'Sulzbach II'; *vide* below under Babylonian Talmud).

Tosæfta. *(Tos)* Zuckermandel, M. S., תוספתא etc. Pasewalk 1880. Zuckermandel, M. S., *Supplement enthaltend Uebersicht, Register und Glossar zu Tosefta.* Trier 1882.

Palestinian Talmud. *(TY).* תלמוד ירושלמי, ed. Krotoschin, תרכ״ו (= 1866). 1 vol. folio (4 columns per folio, cited a, b, c, d).

Babylonian Talmud. *(TB).* תלמוד בבלי, ed. Sulzbach II (»Red Sulzbach» containing the complete *Mišnā*, the Babylonian Talmud *(G^{e}mārā)* and the so-called 'extra-canonical tractates'). ע״ג לקדוש׳ ב or מ׳נ׳יתחטא׳ (= 1755[—1763]). 12 voll., folio (2 columns per folio, cited a, b).

Note. The names of the different tractates of the *Mišnā, Tosæftā,* and *Talmuđim,* are abbreviated as follows: *B^{e}r.* (B^{e}raꝁōþ), (*Pēʾā-Bikkurim* not abbreviated), *Šab* (Šabbaþ), *ʿEr* (ʿEruƀīn), *P^{e}s* (P^{e}sāḥīm), *Yōm* (Yōmā), *Suk.* (Sukkā), *Bēṣā* (Bēṣā, Yōm Ṭōƀ), *RhŠ* (Roš ha-s Šānā), *Taʿan* (Ta^{ʿa}niþ), *M^{e}ḡ* (M^{e}ḡillā), *Mo. Q* (Moʿēđ Qāṭān), *Ḥ^{a}ḡ* (Ḥ^{a}ḡiḡā), *Y^{e}ƀ* (Y^{e}ƀāmōþ), *K^{e}þ* (K^{e}þubbōþ), *N^{e}đ* (N^{e}đārim), *Nāz* (Nāzir), *Giṭ* (Giṭṭin), *Soṭ* (Sōṭā), *Qid* (Qiddušīn), *BQ* (Bāƀā Qammā), *BM* (Bāƀā M^{e}ṣīʿā), *BB* (Bāƀā Bāþ^{e}rā), *Sanh.* (Sanhæđrīn), *Mak.* (Makkōþ), *Š^{e}ƀu* (Š^{e}ƀuʿōþ), *ʿEđ* (Eđuyyōþ), *ʿ^{A}ƀ. Z.* (ʿ^{A}ƀōđā Zārā), *ʾAƀ* or *Pirqē ʾĀƀ.* (ʾĀƀōþ), *Hōr* (Hōrāyōþ), *Z^{e}ƀ* (Z^{e}ƀāḥīm), *M^{e}n* (M^{e}nāḥōþ), *Ḥul.* (Ḥullīn), *B^{e}ꝁor.* (B^{e}ꝁōrōþ), *ʿAr* (ʿ^{A}rāꝁīn), *T^{e}m* (T^{e}mūrā), *K^{e}r* (K^{e}rīþōþ), *M^{eʿ}ilā* (M^{eʿ}ilā), *Tamiđ, Midd.* (Middōþ), *Qin* (Qinnim), (*Kēlīm—Miqu̯āʿōþ* not abbreviated), *Nıd* (Niddā), *Māꝁš.* (Maꝁsīrīn), *Zaƀ* (Zāƀim), *Ṭ^{e}ƀ Y* (Ṭ^{e}ƀūl Yōm), *Yāđ* (Yāđaim), *ʿUqṣ* (ʿUqṣīn).

The *Mišnā* and *Tosæftā* are cited with name of tractate, numbers of *pǽræq* and section, the *Talmuđim* with name of tractate, number of folio and letter of column.

Thus: *M Yāđ* 3 2 = *Mišna,* tractate ידים, *pǽræq* 3, section 2 (Sulzbach II, vol. 12, fol. 171 b).

Tos B B 7 16 = *Tosæftā,* tractate בבא בתרא, *pǽræq* 7, section 16 (Zuckermandel, p. 408).

TY Ta^{ʿa}n 64 c = Palestinian Talmud, tractate *Ta^{ʿa}nīþ,* fol. 64, column c, in ed. Krotoschin (*g^{e}mārā* to first *pǽræq* of *M Ta^{ʿa}n).*

BB ʿ^{A}ƀ. Z 54 a = Babylonian Talmud, tractate *ʿ^{A}ƀōđā Zārā,* fol. 54, col. a of the tractate (found in vol. 8 of Sulzbach II).

b) Miđraš.

M^{e}ꝁilþā מכילתא *(M^{e}ꝁ),* ed. Venezia ש״ח (1558), anast. reprint Berlin תרפ״ה (1925), folio, 4 coll.

Sifrā ספרא, edd. as preceding.

Sifrē ספרי, edd. as preceding.

M^{e}ꝁilþā d^{e} Rabbi Šimʿōn bæn Yoḥai (M^{e}k R. Šim. b. Y.). Mechilta de-Rabbi Simon b. Jochai, ein halachischer und haggadischer Midrasch zu Exodus nach handschriftlichen und gedruckten Quellen reconstruirt . . . von D. Hoffmann. Frankf. a. M. 1905.

Sifrē Zuṭā, in *Siphre ad Numeros adjecto Siphre Zutta*, ed. H. S. Horowitz, pp. 225—336 *(Corpus Tannaiticum*, Sectio III, Pars III, Fascic. I). Leipzig 1917.

Miđraš Tannāʾīm, מדרש תנאים, Midrasch Tannaim zum Deuteronomium . . . gesammelt von D. Hoffmann. Berlin 1909.

»*Miđraš Rabbā*» or »*Miđraš Rabbōᵽ*»:
Ƀᵉrēšīᵽ Rabbā (*Gen. R.* = *Miđraš Rabbā* to Genesis).
Šᵉmōᵽ Rabbā (Exod. R.).
U̯ayyiqrā Rabbā (Lev. R.).
Ƀ̑ᵉmiđbar Rabbā (Num. R.).
Dᵉƀārīm Rabbā (Deut. R.).
Miđraš ʾĒk̄ā (Lam. R.).
Miđraš Šir ha-šŠīrīm (*Cant R.).*
Miđraš Rūᵽ (Ruth R.).
Miđraš Qohǽlæᵽ (Eccl. R.).
Miđraš Æstēr (Ester R.).
All cited from the collective edition מדרש רבה, Varshava 1877, 5 voll., folio, 2 coll.

Miđraš Tanḥuma מדרש תנחומא *(Tanḥ.)*, ed. לעווין־עפשט״ן. Warshava s. a.

Pᵉsiqᵽā dᵉRaƀ Kāhᵃnā (Pᵉs), ed. S. Buber, פסיקתא. Lyck 1868.

Pᵉsiqᵽā Rabbāᵽi (Pᵉs R.), ed. M. Friedmann. Wien 1880.

Miđraš Šōḥēr Ṭoƀ, ed. Varshava 1875.

Yalquṭ Šimʿoni (Yalq(uṭ)), ed. Varshava, I 1876, II 1877, folio, 4 coll.

Note. The miđrašim called '*Rabbā*' or '*Rabbōᵽ*' are cited with number of *pārāšim* and sections, *Yalquṭ* with number of volume and paragraph, the other miđrašim acc. to folio and column.

Of the less important *miđrašim*, not mentioned above, when occasionally referred to, all particulars are given in the text.

c) *Targum.*

Targum Onkelos, ed. A. Berliner. Berlin 1884.

Palestinian Targum, תרגום יונתן בן עוזיאל, in 'Rabbinical Bible'.

Targum to Prophets and Hagiographa:
de Lagarde, P., *Prophetæ Chaldaicæ.* Leipzig 1872.
——, *Hagiographa Chaldaicæ.* Leipzig 1873.

Etheridge, J. W., *Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel* (transl.), 2 voll. London 1862—65.

d) *Liturgy.*

Siddur of R. ʿAmram סדור ר׳ עמרם גאון. Varshava 1865.

Seligman Bær, *ʿAƀođaꝑ Israʾel.* Rödelheim 1868 (1901).

The Authorized Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire, ed. by S. Singer; *with a Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, by I. Abrahams. London 1922.

סדור תפלת ישראל *The Order of Prayers translated, compared and revised,* by R. Mayer. Wien 1921.

Siddur etc., by D. A. de Sola, revised by M. Gaster. London 1907.

4) *Jewish Mystical Literature.*

3 Enoch, ed. H. Odeberg. Cambridge 1928.

Séfær ʾEliyyahu, ed. M. Buttenwieser. Leipzig 1897.

Alphabet of R. ʿᴬqiƀā, ed. Amsterdam 1708.

Šiʿur Qōmā, in ספרא דאדם קדמאה. Varshava 1865.

Séfær Yᵉṣirā, ed. Varshava s. a.

Hēꝁāloꝑ Rabbāꝑi, in Eisenstein, *ʾOṣar Miđrašim*, i p. 111 ff.

Hēꝁālōꝑ Zōṭᵉrāꝑī, Bodleian Ms. Mich. 9, foll. 66 a—70 b.

Massǽꝁæꝑ Hēꝁālōꝑ, in *Arze Lᵉƀānōn.* Venezia 1601.

Zóhar, ed. Lublin 1903, 3 voll.

Tiqqune ha-zZóhar, ed. Livorno 1854.

Zohar ḥāđāš, ed. Koreẓ 1774.

Miđraš ha-nNæ ʿᵆlām, printed with the preceding.

Yalquṭ Rᵉuƀeni, ed. Varshava 1901 *(YR).*

J. General Literature.

Abbott, Edwin A., *Johannine Vocabulary. A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with those of the Three.* London 1905.

——, *Johannine Grammar.* London 1914.

Abelson, J., *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature.* London 1912.

——, *Jewish Mysticism* (*The Quest Series* ed. by G. R. S. Mead). London 1913.

Angus, S., *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity, A Study in the Religious Background of Early Christianity.* London 1925.

Anrich, G., *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum.* Göttingen 1894.

Bacher, W., *Die Agada der Tannaiten. I. Von Hillel bis Akiba*^{2}. Strassburg 1903. II. *Von Akibas Tod bis zum Abschluss der Mischna.* Strassburg 1890.

——, *Die Agada der palästinensischen Amoräer.* I. *Von Abschluss der Mischna bis zum Tode Jochanans.* Strassburg 1892.

——, *Die Agada der babylonischen Amoräer. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Agada und zur Einleitung in den babylonischen Talmud.* Strassburg 1878.

Bacon, B. W., *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate. A Series of Essays on Problems concerning the Origin and Value of the Anonymous Writings attributed to the Apostle John.* New York 1910.

von Baer, Heinrich, *Der heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom alten und neuen Testament,* Dritte Folge Heft 3).

Barton, George A., *Studies in New Testament Christianity.* Philadelphia, U. S. A., 1928.

——, *The Origin of the Discrepancy between the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel as to the Date and Character of Christ's Supper with his Disciples* (*Journal of Biblical Literature* xliii 1924 pp. 28 ff.).

von Baudissin, W. W., *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte.* Giessen 1926—29.

Bauer, W., *Das Johannesevangelium*^{2}. *(Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann *6).* Tübingen 1925.

Baur, F. Chr., *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältniss zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung.* Tübingen 1847.

Behm, J., *Die mandäische Religion und das Christentum.* Leipzig 1927.

Belser, *Das Evangelium des heiligen Johannes, übersetzt und erklärt.* Freiburg i. B. 1905.

Belvalkar, S. K., *Four Unpublished Upaniṣadic Texts* etc. Madras 1925.

Bennett, Ch. A., *A Philosophical Study of Mysticism.* New Haven, U. S. A. 1923.

Bergmann, *Die stoische Philosophie und die jüdische Frömmigkeit* (*Judaica, Festschrift zu Hermann Cohens siebzigsten Geburtstag.* Berlin 1912, pp. 145—166).

Bernard, J. H, Archbishop, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John,* edited by A. H. Mc. Neile (*The International Critical Commentary,* edd. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, C. A. Briggs) 2 voll. Edinburgh 1928.

Bert, G., *Das Evangelium des Johannes. Versuch einer Lösung seines Grundproblems.* Gütersloh 1922.

Bischoff, Erich, *Die Kabbalah. Einführung in die jüdische Mystik und Geheimwissenschaft*^{2}. Leipzig 1917.

Bludau, August, *Die Ersten Gegner der Johannesschriften.* (*Biblische Studien, begründet von Prof. Dr. Otto Bardenhewer, fortgeführt von Dr. Joh. Göttsberger und Dr. Jos. Sickenberger.* Zweiundzwanzigster Band. Erstes und zweites Heft). Freiburg im Breisgau 1925.

Boehmer, Julius, *Das Johannesevangelium nach Aufbau und Grundgedanken.* Eisleben 1928.

Bornhäuser, K., *Das Johannesevangelium eine Missionsschrift für Israel* (*Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie* herausgegeben von Schlatter, A. und Lütgert, W., 2. Reihe. *Sammlung wissenchaftlicher Monographien.* 15 Band). Gütersloh 1928.

Bousset, W., *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* herausgegeben von W. Bousset und H. Gunkel. 10. Heft). Göttingen 1907.

Bousset, W., (—Gressmann, H.), *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter.* In dritter, verbesserter Auflage herausgegeben von Hugo Gressmann. (*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* herausgeg. von H. Lietzmann.) Tübingen 1926.

Box, G. H., *Early Christianity and Its Rivals.* London 1929.

——, *The Jewish Environment of Early Christianity.* (*The Expositor* 8th Series no. 67, July 1916, 42nd Year 1—25).

Brandt, A. J. H. Wilhelm, *Die Mandäische Religion, ihre Entwickelung und geschichtliche Bedeutung.* Leipzig 1889.

——, *Mandäische Schriften aus der grossen Sammlung heiliger Bücher genannt Genzâ oder Sidrâ Rabbâ.* Göttingen 1893.

Bretschneider, C. Th., *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis Apostoli, indole et origine eruditorum judiciis modeste subjecit . . .* Leipzig 1820.

Brooke, A. E., *The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge Biblical Essays).*

Büchsel, F., *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament.* Gütersloh 1926.

——, *Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus* (*Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, herausgegeben von Schlatter, A. und Lütgert, W. 2. Reihe *Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Monographien.* 16. Band.) Gütersloh 1920.

——, *Mandäer und Johannesjünger.* (*Z. Nt. W.*, xxvi, 1927, pp. 219—231).

Bultmann, R., *Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums.* (*Z. Nt. W.*, xxiv, 1925, pp. 100—146).

——, *Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannesevangelium* (*Eucharisterion* H. Gunkel dargeb. I 3—26).

——, *Untersuchungen zum Johannesevangelium.* (*Z. Nt. W.*, xxvii, 1928, pp. 113—173).

Buonaiuti, Ernesto, *Gnostic Fragments, Edited with an Introduction and Notes*, done into English by Edith Cowell. London 1924.

Burch, Vacher, *The Structure and Message of St. John's Gospel.* London 1928.

Burkitt, F. C., *The Mandæans.* (*J. Th. St.*, xxix, 1928, pp. 225—235).

——, *Note on Ginza Rabba 174.* (*J. Th. St.*, xxix, 1928, pp. 235—237).

Burney, C. F., *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel.* Oxford 1922.

Burrows, M., *The Johannine Prologue as Aramaic Verse.* (*Journal of Biblical Literature* xlv 1926 pp. 57—69).

Burton, Ernest De Witt, *Spirit, Soul and Flesh. Historical and Linguistic Studies in Literature Related to the New Testament.* Reprinted, with Additions and Revision from the *American Journal of Theology* 1913, 2nd Series Volume 3. Chicago 1918.

Calmes, P. Th., *L'Évangile selon Saint Jean.* Paris 1904.

Camerlynck, A., *De Quarti Evangelii Auctore.* Leuven 1890.

Carpenter, J. Estlin, *The Johannine Writings. A Study Of the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel.* London 1927.

Chakkarai, V., *Jesus the Avatar. (Christian Literature Society for India).* Madras 1926.

Chapman, J., Dom. *John the Presbyter.* Oxford 1911.

——, *Names in the Fourth Gospel.* (*J. Th. St.,* xxix, 1928, pp. 16—23).

Charles, R. H., *Religious Development between the Old and the New Testaments.* London 1914, 1919, 1921. *(Home University Library of Modern Knowledge).*

Charnwood, Lord, *According to St. John.* London 1926.

Clemen, C., *Die Entstehung der Johannesevangeliums.* Halle (1912).

——, *Fontes Historiæ Religionum ex Auctoribus Græcis et Latinis Collectos* . . . ed. Carolus Clemen. Fasc. I. *Fontes Historiæ Religionis Persicæ* collegit Carolus Clemen, Bonn 1920. Fasc. II. *Fontes Historiæ Religionis Aegyptiacæ,* collegit Th. Hopfner. Bonn 1922—25.

——, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments.* Giessen 1924.

Cumont, F., *Mithra ou Sarapis* Κοσμοϰϱ΄τωϱ (*Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances 1919* p. 313 f.)

Dalman, I., *Jesus-Jeschua. Die drei Sprachen Jesu. Jesus in der Synagoge, auf dem Berge, am Kreuz.* Leipzig 1922.

Delff, H. K. H., *Das Vierte Evangelium Ein authentischer Bericht über Jesus von Nazareth.* Husum 1890.

Dibelius, M., *Joh.* 15^{13} (*Festschrift für Deissmann.* Tübingen 1927).

Dieterich, A. — Weinreich, O., *Eine Mithrasliturgie*^{3}. Leipzig 1923.

Dittmar, Wilhelm, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo. Die alttestamentlichen Parallelen des Neuen Testaments im Wortlaut der Urtexte und der Septuaginta zusammengestellt.* Göttingen 1903.

Dods, M., *The Gospel of St. John. (The Expositor's Greek Testament* i*).* 1897.

Dornseiff, Franz, *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*^{2}. (*ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Weltbildes und der griechischen Wissenschaft* herausgegeben von Franz Boll, Heft VII). Leipzig, Berlin 1925.

Drummond, James, *An Inquiry into the Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.* London 1903.

Easton, Burton Scott, *The Gospel before the Gospels.* New York 1928.

Ebrard, J. H. A., *Das Evangelium Johannis und die neueste Hypothese über sein Entstehung.* Zürich 1845.

Eidem, Erling, *Det kristna livet enligt Paulus.* I. Stockholm 1927.

Elbogen, Ismar, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*^{2}. *(Schriften herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums. Grundriss der Gesamtwissenschaft des Judentums).* Frank. a. M. 1924.

Ely, M. R., *Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought.* New York 1925.

Entwicklungsstufen der Jüdischen Religion. Mit Beiträgen von Leo Baeck, Juda Bergmann, Ismar Elbogen, Hugo Gressmann, Julius Guttman, Michael Guttman. *(Vorträge des Institutum Judaicum an der Universität Berlin).* Giessen 1927.

Eschelbacher, Joseph, *Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christentums*^{2}. *(Schriften herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin).* Berlin 1908.

Eschelbacher, M., *Probleme der talmudischen Dialektik.* (*Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, Neue Folge 32, 1927, pp. 47—66, 126—150).

Fascher, E., ***ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ****, Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung.* Giessen 1927.

Faure, A., *Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese.* (*Z. Nt. W.* 21. 1922 pp. 99—121).

Fendt, Leonhard, *Gnostische Mysterien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes.* München 1922.

Fiebig, P., *Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu.* Tübingen 1904.

Fletcher, Scott M., *The Psychology of the New Testament*^{2}. London and Aylesbury 1912.

Fries, S. A., *Det fjärde evangeliet och Hebréer-evangeliet. Bidrag till frågan om de Johanneiska skrifternas uppkomst och det fjärde evangeliets betydelse för urkristendomens historia.* Stockholm 1898.

Frövig, D. A., *Der Kyriosglaube des Neuen Testaments und das Messiasbewusstsein Jesu. (Beiträge zur Förderung der christlichen Theologie).* 2 Heft 6. Gütersloh 1928.

Gardner, Percy, *The Ephesian Gospel.* Second Impression. London 1916.

Garvie, Alfred E., *The Beloved Disciple. Studies of the fourth Gospel.* London s. a.

Gaskell, G. A., *Gnostic Scriptures Interpreted.* London 1927.

Gaster, Moses, *The Samaritans. Their History, Doctrines and Literature. With six Appendices und nineteen Illustrations. (The British Academy. The Schweich Lectures)* 1923. London 1925.

Gavin, F., *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments (Chapman Lectures).* London 1928.

Ginsburg, Chr. D., *The Kabbalah, Its Doctrines, Development, and Literature,* 2nd impression. London 1920.

Goetz, K. G., *Das Abendmahl eine Diatheke Jesu oder sein letztes Gleichnis? Eine Untersuchung.* Leipzig 1920 (*Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament,* herausg. v. H. Windisch Heft 8.)

Goguel, Maurice J., *Jésus et la tradition religieuse de son peuple.* (*R Hist Ph R.* vii, 4 1927) pp. 245—252.

——, *La notion johannique de l'esprit et ses antécédents historiques.* Paris 1902.

——, *Les sources du récit johannique de la Passion,* La Roche-sur-Yon 1910.

——, *Introduction au Noveau Testament, tome II, la quatrième évangile (Bibliothèque Historique des Religions).* Paris 1923.

Goodspeed, Edgar J., *New Solutions of New Testament Problems.* Chicago 1927.

——, *The Formation of the New Testament.* Chicago 1926. 3rd impr. 1927.

——, *The Story of the New Testament.* Chicago 1916. *(The University of Chicago Publications in Religious Education.* Edited by Sharler Mathews, Theodore G. Soares, W. W. Charters. *Handbooks of ethics and religion).*

Gressmann, H., *Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Ursprungs der hellenistischen Erlösungsreligion, II—IV.* (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.* Neue Folge, 4, pp. 154—180.) Stuttg. 1922.

——, *Die Aufgaben der Wissenschaft des nachbiblischen Judentums* (1925).

Grill, J., *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung der vierten Evangeliums.* I Tübingen 1902, II Tübingen 1923.

Gronau, K., *Poseidonios und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese.* Leipzig 1914.

Güdemann, M., *Das Judenthum im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter in christlicher Darstellung (Monatsschrift für Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenthums,* Neue Folge, 11, 1903, pp. 38—53, 120—136, 231—249).

Gyllenberg, Rafael, *Kristusbilden i Hebreerbrevet.* Helsingfors 1928.

——, *Pistis. En undersökning beträffande bruket och betydelsen av ΠΙΣΤΙΣ och därmed besläktade ord i det hellenistiska tidevarvets religioner. I. Hellenismen och senjudendomen. II. Kristendomen.* Helsingfors 1922.

v. Harnack, A., *Das ‘Wir’ in den johanneischen Schriften* (*Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie* 1923, pp. 96—113).

Harris, Rendel, *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel.* Cambridge 1917.

—— (-Burch, V.), *Testimonies.* Cambridge 1916; 1920.

Hausrath, A., *Jesus und die neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller.* Berlin, I 1908, II 1909.

Hausschild, J., *Johanneische Studien, Beiträge zur Würdigung des vierten Evangeliums.* Gütersloh 1928.

Heinrici, C. F. G., *Die Hermes-Mystik und das Neue Testament.* (*Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentums.* 1. Band. 1. Heft). Leipzig 1918.

Heitmüller, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (*Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* iv). Göttingen 1908.

Hemsen, J. T., *Die Authentie der Schriften des Evangelisten Johannes.* Schleswig 1823.

Hengstenberg, E. W., *Das Evangelium des heiligen Johannes*^{2}. Berlin 1867/70.

Herb, Preisker, *Urchristlicher und mandäischer Erlösungsglaube* (*Theologische Blätter,* Jahrg. 7, 1928, p. 143—151).

Herford, R. Travers, *Pharisaism, its Aim and its Method,* 1912.

——, *The Pharisees,* London 1924.

Hilgenfeld, Ad. *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, urkundlich dargestellt.* Leipzig 1884.

Holtzmann, H. J., *Johanneisches Evangelium. (Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament.)* Freiburg i. B. 1893.

Hopfner, Th., *Orient und griechische Philosophie.* Leipzig 1925. (*Beihefte zum »Alten Orient«* Heft. 4.)

Hunnius, E., *Commentarius in Evangelium de Iesu Christo secundum Ioannem*^{3}. Frank. a. M. 1595.

Jackson, H. Latimer, *The Problem of the Fourth Gospel.* Cambridge 1918.

de Jong, K. H. E., *Das antike Mysterienwesen in religionsgeschichtlicher, ethnologischer und psychologischer Beleuchtung*^{2}. Leiden 1919.

Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity, (Five lectures by A. Cohen, F. C. Burkitt, E. M. Adler, R. Travers Herford and H. St. John Thackeray). London 1924.

Kalisch, I., *Studies in Ancient and Modern Judaism (Selected Writings of Rabbi Isidor Kalisch).* New York 1928.

Keferstein, F., *Philos Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen.* Leipzig 1864.

Keil, C. Fr., *Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes.* Leipzig 1881.

Kittel, G., *Die Lebenskräfte der ersten christlichen Gemeinden.* (Ser. *Lebendige Kirche*, 1). Pforzheim 1926.

——, *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum* (*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament*, Dritte Folge. Heft 1.) Stuttgart 1926.

——, *Urchristentum, Spätjudentum und Hellenismus.* Stuttgart 1926.

Klausner, J., *Jesus of Nazareth, His Life, Times and Teaching. Translated from the Original Hebrew* by Herbert Danby. New York 1925.

——, *The Messianic Idea in Israel from the Earliest Time to the Compilation of the Mishnah*^{2} *(Historico-Philological Library edited by Dr Judah Jonowitz).* Jerusalem 1927.

Knudsin, K., *Topologische Überlieferungsstoffe im Johannes-Evangelium.* Göttingen 1925. *(Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Neue Folge, 22).

Kræling, Carl H., *Anthropos and Son of Man. A Study in the Religious Syncretism of the Hellenistic Orient* (*Columbia University Oriental Studies.* Vol. XXV). New York 1927.

Krengel, J., *Besprechung von H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum N. T. aus Talmud und Midrasch I.* (*Monatsschrift für Geschichte v. Wissenschaft der Judentums. Neue Folge 32,* 1924, pp. 68—82).

Kreyenbühl, Johannes, *Das Evangelium der Wahrheit. Neue*

Lösung der Johanneischen Frage. I. Berlin 1900. II. Berlin 1905.

Kroll, J., *Beiträge zum Descensus ad Inferos. (Vorlesungen an der Akademie zu Braunsberg im Winter 1922/23.)* Königsberg 1922.

——, *Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos.* (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters.* Bd 12). Münster i. W. 1914.

Lagrange, M. J., *Évangile selon Saint Jean*^{3} *(Études Bibliques).* Paris 1927.

——, *La gnose Mandéenne et la tradition évangélique.* (*RB.* xxxvi 1927, pp. 321—349, 481—515 xxxvii 1928).

——, *L'hermétisme* (*RB.* xxxiii 1924, pp. 481—497, xxxiii).

——, *Vers le Logos de Saint Jean* (in *RB.* xxxii 1923, pp. 161—184, 321—371).

——, *Ou en est la dissection littéraire du quatrième évangile?* (*RB.* 33, 1924, pp. 321—342).

Lampe, Fr. A., *Commentarius Analytico-Exegeticus tam literalis quam realis Evangelii Secundum Joannem, I—III.* Amst. 1724—26.

Legge, F., *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity.* Cambridge 1916.

Leisegang, H., *Die Gnosis* (*Kröners Taschenausgabe* Band 32). Leipzig 1924.

——, *Pneuma Hagion (Veröffentlichungen des Forschungsinstituts für vergleichende Religionsgeschichte an der Universität Leipzig.* Nr 4). Leipzig 1922.

Lepin, S. S., *La valeur historique du quatrième évangile.* 2 Tomes. Paris 1910.

——, *L'origine du quatrième évangile.* Paris 1907.

Levertoff, P. P., *Midrash Sifre on Numbers, Selections from Early Rabbinic Scriptural Interpretation with an Introduction* by Rev. Canon G. H. Box. London 1926.

Lidzbarski, M., *Mandäische Fragen* (*Z. Nt. W.* 1927, pp. 70—75).

——, *Alter und Heimat der mandäischen Religion* (*Z. Nt. W.*, xxvii, 1928, pp. 321—327).

Lightfoot, Johannes, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ in Quatuor Evangelistas cum Tractatibus Chorographicis, singulis suo Evangelistæ Præmissis.* Leipzig 1675.

Lindblom, Joh., *Das ewige Leben, Eine Studie über die Entstehung der Religiösen Lebensidee im Neuen Testament.* Upsala 1914.

Lohmeyer, E., *Kyrios Jesus, eine Untersuchung zu Phil.* 2,5–11 (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften; phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1927/28. Abh. 4). Heidelberg 1928.

——, *Über Aufbau und Gliederung des vierten Evangeliums* (*Z. Nt. W.*, xxvii, 1928, pp. 11—36).

Loisy, Alfred, *Le Quatrième Evangile*^{2}. *Les épitres dites de Jean.* Paris 1921.

Marmorstein, A., *Iranische und jüdische Religion mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Begriffe »Wort», »Wohnen» und »Glorie» im IV. Evangelium und in der rabbinischen Literatur* (*Z. Nt. W.* xxvi, 1927, pp. 231—242).

——, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God I. The Names & Attributes of God* (*Jews' College Publications*, No. 10). Oxford 1927.

Mayer, Georg Karl, *Die Aechtheit des Evangeliums nach Johannes.* Schaffhausen 1854.

Mc Neile A. H., *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament.* Oxford 1927.

Merx, A., *Der Messias oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner.* (*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.* Nr 17.) Giessen 1909.

——, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien nach ihren ältesten bekannten Texte.* Matteus 1902, Markus 1905, Johannes 1911.

Messel, N., *Der Menschensohn in den Bilderreden des Henoch.* (*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* n:r 30). Giessen 1922.

Meuschen, Joh. Gerhard (Balth. Scheidius, Jo. Andr. Danz, Jac. Rhenford). *Novum Testamentum ex Talmude et Antiquitatibus Hebræorum Illustratum.* Leipzig 1736.

Mitzka, Franz, *Gnostizismus und Gnadenlehre (Z. K. Th.,* 51, 1927, pp. 60–64).

Montgomery, J. A., *The Origin of the Gospel according to St John.* Philadelphia Winton 1923.

Moore, George Foot, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: the Age of the Tannaim.* 2 voll. Cambridge 1927.

v. Mosheim, J. L., *Erklärung des Evangelii Johannis.* Weimar 1777.

Muirhead, L. A., *The Message of the Fourth Gospel.* London 1926.

Müller, Ernst, *Der Sohar und seine Lehre. Einleitung in die Gedankenwelt der Kabbala*^{2}. Wien 1923.

Nifantus, Chr., *S. Johannis Evangelium commentario perpetuo illustratum.* Fr. a. M. 1684.

Nolloth, Charles Frederick, *The Fourth Evangelist, His Place in the Development of Religious Thought.* London 1925.

Norden, Eduard, *Agnostos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede.* Leipzig 1913.

Nork, F., *Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen zu neutestamentlichen Schriftstellen.* Leipzig 1839.

Nyegaard, E., *Essai sur les Critères Externes de l'authenticité du quatrième Évangile.* Genève 1876.

Nunn, H. P. V., *The Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel.* London 1928,

Odeberg, Hugo, *3 Enoch or the Hebrew book of Enoch.* Cambridge 1928.

Origenes, *Commentary on St. John's Gospel,* Text revised, with a Crit. Introd. by A. E. Brooke. Cambridge 1891.

Overbeck, Frans, *Das Johannesevangelium. Studien zur Kritik seiner Erforschung. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben* von Carl Albrecht Bernoulli. Tübingen 1911.

Pallis, Alex., *Notes on St. John and the Apocalypse.* Oxford s. a. (1926).

——, *Mandæan studies.* Oxford 1926.

Pernot, H., *Études sur la langue des Évangiles.* (*Collection de l'Institut néo-hellénique de l'Université de Paris,* fascicule 7.) Paris 1927.

Peterson, E., *Urchristentum und Mandäismus* (*Z. Nt. W.*, xxvii, 1928, pp. 55—98).

Porter, F. Ch., *Yeçær ha Ra. A Study in Semitic Ideology.* (*J. B. Lit.* 1927, pp. 1—10.)

Radermacher, L., *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*^{2} (H. Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum neuen Testament* 1.) Tübingen 1925.

Rauppius, J., *Bibliotheca Portatilis* III, 6; *Commentarium in Libros N. T. Historicos.* Erfurt 1657.

Reitzenstein, R., *Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen.* Bonn 1921.

Reitzenstein, R., *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung.* (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften Stiftung Heinrich Lanz. Philosophisch-historische Klasse.* Jahrgang 1919. 12. Abhandlung.) Heidelberg 1919.

——, *Die griechischen Mysterienreligionen*^{2}. 1925.

——, *Gedanken zur Entwicklung des Erlöserglaubens.* (*Historische Zeitschrift,* Dritte Folge, 30, pp. 1—57.) München etc. 1922.

—— und Schaeder, H. H., *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland.* Leipzig, Berlin 1926.

——, *Zur Mandäerfrage.* (*Z. Nt. W.* 1927, pp. 39—70.)

Réville, J., *Le quatrième évangile, son origine et sa valeur historique.* Paris 1901.

Riggenbach, E., *Das Comma Johanneum (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie).* Gütersloh 1928.

Rissler, P., *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel.* Augsburg 1927.

Rolt, C. E., *Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology. (Translations of Christian Literature. Series I, Greek Texts.)* London 1920.

von Rosenroth, Knorr, *Kabbala Denudata seu Doctrina Hebræorum Transcendentalis et Metaphysica atque Theologica* etc. 2 Partes. Sulzbach 1677.

Sanday, William, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel. Eight Lectures on the Morse Foundation, delivered in the Union Seminary, New York in Oktober and November 1904.* Oxford 1905.

Sasse, Hermann, *Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium.* (*Z. Nt. W.* 24. Band, pp. 260—277.) Giessen 1925.

Saunders, Kenneth, *The Gospel for Asia.* London 1928.

Schæder, H. H., *Iranische Lehren* (*vide* Reitzenstein und Schæder, *Synkretistische Studien.*)

——, *Die Urform des manichäischen Systems.* Berlin 1922.

Schanz, A., *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Evangelisten Johannes.* Tübingen 1884.

(Schechter, S.), *Geniza Studies in Memory of Doctor Salomon Schechter.* (*Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America,* vols i—iii.) New York 1928.

Scheftelowitz, I., *Die Entstehung der manichäischen Religion und das Erlösungsmysterium.* Giessen 1922.

Schlatter, D. A., *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten.* (Schlatter, D. U., Cremer, D. H., *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie.*) Gütersloh 1902.

Schoettgen, Christian, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ in Universum Novum Testamentum.* Dresden 1733.

Schultz, W., *Dokumente der Gnosis.* Jena 1910.

Schwartz, E., *Aporien im vierten Evangelium.* (*Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse.* Berlin 1907, pp. 342—383; 1908, pp. 125—188, 497—560.)

Scott, E. F., *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology.* Edinburgh 1926.

——, *The Kingdom and the Messiah.* Edinburg 1911.

Seeberg, R., Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. (*Festgabe für A. Harnack,* pp. 263—281.)

Selwyn, E. C., *A Personal Reference to St. Paul in the Fourth Gospel.* (*The Expositor* 8th Series, No. 69. Sept. 1916. pp. 219—236.)

Semler, I. S., *Paraphrasis Evangelii Iohannis.* Magdeburg 1771—72.

Smend, Fr., *Die Behandlung alttestamentlicher Zitate als Ausgangspunkt der Quellenscheidung im 4. Evangelium.* (*Z. Nt. W.* 24. Band, pp. 147—150.) Giessen 1925.

Smith, Harold, *Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Gospels.* London, I 1925, II 1926, III 1927.

Smith, P. V., *The Fourth Gospel: Its Historical Importance.* London 1926.

Soltau, M., *Das Problem des Johannisevangeliums und der Weg zu seiner Lösung.* (*Z. Nt. W.* 1915, pp. 24—53.)

——, *Die Reden des vierten Evangeliums.* (*Z. Nt. W.* 1916, pp. 49—60.)

Spitta, Friedr., *Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu.* Göttingen 1910.

Stærk, W., *Die Probleme des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter.* (*Theol. Blätter* 1927, pp. 45—51.)

Stanton, Vincent Henry, *The Gospels as Historical documents. Part III. The Fourth Gospel.* Cambridge 1920.

Stegmann, B. A., *Christ the Man from Heaven.* (*New Testament Studies of the Catholic University of America.* No. vi.)

Steinmeyer, F. L., *Beiträge zum Verständniss des Johanneischen Evangeliums,* I—VI. Berlin 1886—1891.

Storr, G. Chr., *Ueber den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und der Briefe Johannis.* Tübingen 1786.

Strachan, Robert Harvey, *The Fourth Gospel*^{2}. London 1920.

Strack, H. L., und Billerbeck, P., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* I. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* München 1922. II. *Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas und Johannes und die Apostelgeschichte.* München 1924. III. *Die Briefe des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis.* München 1926. IV. *Exkurse zu einzelnen Stellen des Neuen Testaments.* Zwei Teile. München 1928.

Streeter, B. H., *The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins.* London 1926.

Söderblom, Nathan, *Kristi Pinas Historia.* Stockholm 1928.

Tarnovius, P., *In S. Johannis Evangelium Commentarius.* Rostock 1629.

Taylor, Vincent, *The Fourth Gospel and Some Recent Criticism.* (*Hibbert Journal xxv* 1927, pp. 725—743).

——, *The Psychology of the Johannine Christ-Testimonies.* (*Hibbert Journal* xxiii 1928, pp. 123—137).

Tholuck, A., *Commentar zum Evangelio Johannis*^{3}. Hamburg 1831.

Thoma, Albrecht, *Die Genesis des Johannes-Evangeliums. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Auslegung, Geschichte und Kritik.* Berlin 1882.

Tillman, G., *Das Johannesevangelium übersetzt und erklärt. (Die heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments.)* Berlin 1908.

Titius, A., *Die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart.* I. *Jesu Lehre vom Reiche Gottes.* Freiburg I. B. 1895. II. *Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit.* Tübingen 1900. III. *Die Johanneische Anschauung unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit.* Tübingen 1900.

Treitel, L., *Der Nomos, insonderheit Sabbat und Feste, in philonischer Beleuchtung, an der Hand von Philos Schrift De Septenario.* (*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft der Judenthums.* Neue Folge, 11, 1903, pp. 214—231, 317—321, 490—514.)

Tremenheere, G. H., *The Bearing of Certain Texts on the Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.* (*Theology* 16, 1918, pp. 258—261.)

Trench, G. H., *A Study of St. John's Gospel to which are added: I. The Julian and Jewish Calendars for A. D. 27—29.* II. *A Diary of all the Events in our Lord's Ministry which are Mentioned in the Gospels.* III. *Tables Showing how the Fourth Gospel Dovetails with the three Synoptics.* London 1918.

Troje, L., *Die dreizehn und die zwölf im Traktat Pelliot (Dogmen in Zahlenformeln). Ein Beitrag zu den Grundlagen des Manichäismus.* (*Veröffentlichungen des Forschungsinstituts für vergleichende Religionsgeschichte an der Universität Leipzig* herausgegeben von H. Haas. 11. Reihe. Heft 1.) Leipzig 1925.

Vosté, J.-M., *Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur Saint Jean, d'après la version syriaque.* (*R. B.*, xxxii 1923, pp. 522—551.)

Vulliaud, Paul, *La Kabbale Juive, Histoire et Doctrine (Essai Critique).* 2 Tomes. Paris 1923.

Weber, W., *Christusmystik. Eine religionspsychologische Darstellung der Paulinischen Christusfrömmigkeit.* Leipzig 1924. (*Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament,* herausg. von H. Windisch, Heft 10.)

Weiss, B., *Das Johannesevangelium als einheitliches Werk, geschichtlich erklärt.* Berlin 1912.

——, *Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff in seinen Grundzügen untersucht.* Berlin 1862.

Weiss, K., *Der Prolog des Heiligen Johannes.* Strassburg 1899.

Weizsäcker, Carl, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche*^{2}, Freiburg 1892.

Wellhausen, J., *Das Evangelium Johannis.* Berlin 1908.

——, *Erweiterungen und Änderungen im vierten Evangelium.* Berlin 1907.

Wendt, H. H., *Das Johannesevangelium. Eine Untersuchung seiner Entstehung und seines geschichtlichen Wertes.* Göttingen 1900.

——, *Die Schichten im vierten Evangelium.* Göttingen 1911.

von Wesendonk, *Urmensch und Seele in der iranischen Überlieferung.* Hann 1924.

West, E. W., *Pahlavi Texts*, translated by E. W. West, 5 voll. 1885 seqq. (*The Sacred Books of the East. Translated by Various Oriental Scholars and Edited* by F. Max Müller.)

Westcott, B. F., *The Gospel acc. to St. John.* 1890.

Wetter, G. P., »*Der Sohn Gottes*». *Eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannes-Evangeliums. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Heilandgestalten der Antike.* Göttingen 1916. (*Forschungen zur Rel. u. Lit. des A. u. N. T:s.* Neue Folge, Heft. 9.)

——, *Die* »*Verherrlichung*» *im Johannesevangelium. Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zu dem vierten Evangelium mit Ausgangspunkt von Jh. 12, 27 ff., 13, 31 ff. und 17, 1 ff.* (*Beiträge zur Rel.-Wiss.* II). 1914.

Windisch, H., *Die Absolutheit des Johannesevangeliums. (Sonderheft aus der Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie.)* Gütersloh 1917.

——, *Johannes und die Synoptiker.* (*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom N. T.*, herausg. v. H. Windisch.) Berlin 1923.

Wuttig, *Das Johanneische Evangelium und seine Abfassungszeit. Andeutungen zu einer veränderten Datierung des vierten Evangeliums.* Leipzig 1897.

Zahn, Th., *Das Evangelium des Johannes.* Leipzig 1912.

Zickendraht, K., *ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ* (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken* 94, Sonderheft: *Neutestamentliche Forschungen*, 1922, pp. 162—168).

Zurhellen, Otto, *Die Heimat des vierten Evangeliums.* (*Theologische Arbeiten aus dem rheinischen wissenschaftlicheu Prediger-Verein.* Neue Folge. Elftes Heft.) Tübingen 1909.

Abbreviations.

Ch. Q. R.: Church Quarterly Review.
E. Th. R.: Études Theologiques et Religieuses.
Exp. Ti.: The Expository Times.
H. Th. R.: Harvard Theological Review.
J: Jesus.
J. B. Lit.: Journal of Biblical Literature.
J. Th. St.: Journal of Theological Studies.
Jn: (John) the author of the Fourth Gospel.
Jn ine: Johannine.
N. T.: New Testament.
O. T.: Old Testament.
R. B.: Revue Biblique.
R. Hist. Ph. R.: Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses.
T. St.: Texts and Studies.
Th.: Theology, a Monthly Journal.
Th. St. K.: Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
Z. K. Th.: Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie.
Z. Nt. W.: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.

For abbrevations of sources *vide* above under Sources and Literature, esp. *F.* and *I.* 3).

1^{51} **ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.** The allusion in this utterance to Gen 28^{12} is immediately apparent and generally recognized. The OT passage in question had been the subject of much speculations in Jewish circles, both Palestinian and those of the Diaspora, long before Jn. It has been especially adaptable for mystical notions, and has indeed remained a favourite source of similes for mystical doctrines up to the present day. The picture of the »Jacob's-ladder» immediately appeals to a mystic mind as echoing a certain inner experience or conviction. The question here arises whether the Jn-ine passage links up consciously not merely with the OT-passage but with some particular or generally current speculations on or interpretations of Gen 28^{12}. A hint of the wide range of speculations attached by the Rabbinical teachers to Gen 28^{12} may be found in *Gen R* 68$_{18}$ (*Yalq.* nr 119) which runs as follows:

ר' חייא [רבה] ור' ינאי חד אמר עולים ויורדין בסולם וחד
אמר עולים ויורדים ביעקב [מ"ד עולים ויורדים בסולם ניחא ומ"ד
עולים ויורדים ביעקב] מעלים ומורידים בו אפזים בו קפזים בו
סונטים בו (שנאמר) ישראל אשר בך אתפאר (Isa 49^{3}) את הוא
שאיקונך (שלך) חקוק(ה) למעלה עולין למעלה [ומוצאין] (רואים)
איקונין שלו ויורדין למטה ומוצאין אותו ישן משל למלך שהיה
יושב ודן עולים לבסילקי ומוציאין אותו יושב ודן יורדין בפרוזד
ומוצאין אותו ישן. (ד"א למעלן כל מי שהוא אומר זכותו עולה
חובתו יורד, למטן כל מי שהוא אומר זכותו יורד חובתו עולה.)
ד"א עולים ויורדים בו, עולים אותם שליוו אותו בארץ ישראל
יורדים אלו שליוו אותו בחוצה לארץ. ר' לוי בשם ר' שמואל בר
נחמן אמר מלאכי השרת על ידי שגלו מסטירין שלהקב"ה נדחו
ממחיצתן קל"ח שנה

R. Ḥiyya and R. Yannai (1st generation Palestinian Amoraim) interpreted the *bō* [= 'on it' or 'on him'] of Gen 28^{12} differently; the one said: the angels ascended and descended on the ladder [i. e. *bō* = 'on *it*'], the other said: they ascended and descended on Jacob: they raised him up and put him down, they leapt on him, ran on him, teased him; (as) it is written: (Isa 49^{3}) [Thou art my servant] o, Israel, in whom I will be glorified. 'Thou', that is said in the sense of 'thy image which is engraved on high'. They ascended on high and found (beheld) his image, they descended on earth and found him sleeping. This may be likened unto a king who is seated in judgement (sits and judges): they (= one) ascend to [his] βασιλικὴ and find him seated in judgement, they descend into [his] antechamber [cabinet], and find him sleeping. Another tradition: Above on high every one who speaks in his favour ascends and [he who accuses him of] guilt descends; below one earth, every one who speaks in his favour descends and [he who accuses him of guilt] ascends.[1] Another tradition: ... The ascending ones are those who accompanied him in Palestine, the descending ones are those who accompanied him outside Palestine. [The same angels did not associate themselves with Jacob outside Palestine as in Palestine. When he left Palestine, the former angels ascended the ladder, and other ones descended to accompany him during his sojourn outside Palestine.] R. Leui said in the name of R. Š^{e}mu'el bar Naḥman (3rd generation Palestinian Amoraim): »the ministering angels were driven out from their celestial abode (*m^{e}ḥiṣa*) for 138 years because they revealed the mysteri[es] (*misṭērin*, μυστήριον) of the Holy One». Another manner of commenting upon Gen 28^{12} is recorded in *Tanḥ 38 a* which runs as follows: »R. Š^{e}mu'el bar Naḥman said: those (the angels ascending and descending) are the (angelic) princes of the idolatrous nations ... the prince of Babel ascended seventy steps (=years) and descended, and that of Media fifty steps, and that of Greece hundred and descended, and that of Edom (= Rome) ascended and he did not know how many (steps). In that hour Jacob our father was frightened and said: will there then be no descent for this one? The Holy One said to him (Jerem. 30^{10}): »Therefore fear thou not, O my servant Jacob, saith the Lord; neither be dismayed, O Israel»; even if it could be that thou shouldst see him ascend (as high as) to me, I would throw him down». Another tradition has it that the Holy One showed Jacob the descent even of Greece and then invited Jacob to ascend. But Jacob feared, seeing that all the four preceding princes had descended. Then the Holy One answered him: if thou ascendest, there will be no descent for thee. But he did not believe and did not ascend. Then the Holy One, said to him: »If thou hadst ascended and believed, there would not have been any descent for thee. But since thou didst not believe, lo, thy children will be subdued under those four kingdoms in this world with tributes and annonas and capitation taxes». The passage ends with a dictum of consolation: »I will chastise thee with chastisements in this world in order to cleanse thee from thy iniquities in the time to come. Therefore it is said: and he slept.»

---

[1] This is explained as follows: on high every one who speaks in favour of Israel is exalted, the accuser of Israel, however, abased; on earth again, every one who accuses (and prosecutes) Israel gets a high position, his defender is abased *Matt^{e}nōp K^{e}hunnā ad loc.*

In this congeries of homiletical, allegorical, popular and mystical dicta so characteristic of the Midrash expositions of scriptural passages in general, there are embodied a few traditions that throw light on the present Johannine passage. Thus, to begin with, there is the record of the two variant interpretations put upon the בו of Gen 28^{12}, one taking it in the sense of 'on the ladder', the other in the sense of 'on Jacob'. Now Jn 1^{51} evidently adopts or bases upon the latter sense (ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), in contrast to LXX which renders בו by ἐπ' αὐτῆς, 'on it', referring to the κλίμαξ (ladder). Burney[1] has pointed out that the Jn-ine interpretation presupposes a direct reference to the Hebrew original, and cannot be derived from the LXX. The value of the *GenR*-parallel may be said to be, that it shows the interpretation on which Jn bases to have been current (beside the usual one) also in Jewish circles. That the latter did not derive the interpretation in question from Jn or from Christian exegesis needs no demonstration.

Another part of the quoted exposition in *GenR* worth consideration in the present connexion, is the one betraying a mystical background in speaking of the *iqonin*, εἰκόνιον, (image) of man on high in contraposition to and conjunction with man in his appearance on earth.[2] The Divine utterance 'I will be glorified in thee' [LXX: ἐν σοι ἐνδοξασθήσομαι] — so the dictum implies — does not refer to Israel as he is in his earthly appearance (i. e. as Jacob), but to his ideal counterpart in heaven, his celestial appearance (i. e. as Israel properly). The *contrast* obtaining between man's celestial and terrestrial appearance is thus emphasized by the dictum. In view of the simile used as illustration (the King in

---

[1] *AOFG p. 115.*

[2] Cf. Burney, *AOFG* pp. 116 f. note. The idea of εἰκόνιον recurs in *PTarg* to Gen 28^{12}.

Judgement contrasted with the King in sleep) there is not doubt but that the celestial appearance is meant to be conveyed as the real man. Further, the 'sleep' is also, in all probability, taken in a mystical sense: the earthly man is, in regard to his real life, as one who sleeps.[1] Between the sleeping man, the earthly man unaware of his real life, and the celestial man, or 'image', there is, so far, no connecting bridge, except the identity in essence. Here, however, the ascending and descending angels step in. They symbolize the connexion of the earthly man with his celestial counterpart; this connecting up of the earthly man with the celestial man is frustrated in the case of man in general by his being engulfed in sleep. On the background of these mystical interpretations of the ascent and descent of the angels on man, some light may be thrown upon the meaning of Joh. 1^{51}: the disciples of Jesus will see the angels of God ascending and descending upon the son of man *i. e.* they will see the connexion being brought about between the celestial appearance, the Glory, δόξα, of Christ, and his appearance in the flesh; it implies the manifestation (φανέρωσις) of his δόξα (2^{11}) on earth. This agrees with the use of the term υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου which in Joh as Bauer[2] puts it means »the from heaven descended one (3^{13}) who will also be elevated thither again (3^{14} 6^{62} 8^{28} 12^{34}) in order to receive the glorification (12^{23} 13^{31})», i. e. δοξασθῆναι, cf. the linking up by the mystical tradition referred to above of Gen 28^{12} with Isa 49^{3} (of the glorification of God in the celestial man) and cf. this with 13^{31}: νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ* etc. (Now is the son of man glorified and God is glorified in him.)

Thus the unification of the celestial man and his appearance in the flesh is *eo ipso* a communion with the 'Father', under the aspect of the ἀνάβασις, and a revelation of the Father, under the aspect of the κατάβασις: ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα (14^{9}) ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστιν (14^{10}). The import of this will be more apparent if one considers the question: where is the fulfilment of the promise contained in 1^{51} related by Jn? This question has been answered by Th. Zahn[3], B. Weiss[4], a. o., to the effect, that the fulfilment begins already with the miracle of Kana, 2^{1-11}, where Jesus, acc.

---

[1] Cf. Eph. 5^{14}, Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erl. Myst.* pp. 6, 135.

[2] *JEv*^{2} p. 40. cf. Estlin Carpenter *JWr* pp. 365 f. and the discussion on the connotation of the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου below on 13^{31}.

[3] *EvJoh*^{5,6} p. 145.

[4] *JEv*^{9} p. 88.

to Jn, ἐφανέρωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ. 1^{51} is interpreted as the »announcement of the wonderful deeds of Jesus» and the narrative of 2^{1-11} is by vs. 11 indicated as the explanation of 1^{51}. That may be possible but to the interpretation of 1^{51} here vindicated, the answer would rather have to be formulated thus: the promise of 1^{51}, as contained in the ὄψεσθε, and even as connected with the μείζω τούτων ὄψῃ of 1^{50}, does not refer to a particular object of vision, to a σημεῖον, or to an object of vision *quâ* object, but to a particular subjective faculty of the seer, which enables him to perceive — one might be tempted to add: permanently, and with increasing clearness — the δόξα of Christ: the union of the celestial with the terrestrial. Hence it may be urged, that Grill is right when observing[1]: »in connection with the announcement by Jesus to Nathanael that he would henceforth behold 'greater things' than those perceived when being called (one cannot) think of the signs (miracle) that are dealt with in the following. To the elect firstlings of the disciples, which firstlings already at their calling had not needed any sign (miracle), (to them) what the sequel brings by way of signs cannot possibly be something greater.»

The φανέρωσις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ spoken of in 2^{11} refers to a lower plane of perceiving faculty, yea, to a lower class of perceivers than that or those spoken of in $1^{50, 51}$. And the fulfilment of the promise of $1^{50, 51}$ cannot be represented by the relation in the following context of *any* happening, or event, or σημεῖον.[2] If 1^{51} is to be connected with any particular passage in the following, it should be not with 2^{11} or 11^{40} but with such passages as $14^{9, 10, 13, 19}$: ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τόν πατέρα . . . ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ . . . ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ . . . ἔτι μικρὸν καὶ ὁ κόσμος με οὐκέτι θεωρεῖ, ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτέ με, ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσετε.

In fact, the verse contains a clear indication as to in what connexion the utterance should be brought with the sequel of the Gospel, viz. through the use here of the term υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The occurence of that term gives a special significance to the present utterance, in particular by pointing to a realm of truth beyond the actual scope of the words. The general significance of the term υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Jn has already been touched upon and will be fully discussed below, in the excursus to Jn 13_{31}. Here, however, a preliminary question respecting the connotation of the term may be considered.

---

[1] *Unters.* ii 69.

[2] That the σημεῖα are conceived of as having their significance even in relation to the 'higher perceivers' is another matter; naturally *they* also, are to Jn, perceived in them the manifestation of the δόξα or, at the most, were strengthened through them in their belief or their vision, a vision that they, however, already possessed continually.

(1) Then it has first to be emphasized that 1^{51}, or, as one might also put it, the Jn-ine interpretation or use of the symbol of Gn 28^{12} is *necessarily and essentially bound up with the »Son of Man»*. That is to say, there is no ascent and descent of the angels, no 'heaven opened', no union of the celestial man with the terrestrial *without* the Son of Man.[1]

This might be contrasted with the representation of the Midrash given above. Israel-Jacob does not, in the Midrash passage, function as the unique and always present subject of the unification of celestial and terrestrial. There may be an underlying idea of exclusiveness, viz. that of the restriction of the Celestial converse with earthly man to the people of Israel; that exclusiveness is, however, not explicit. The main signification of Israel-Jacob is that of 'type'. At this point it may be apposite to contrast also the Philonic interpretations of Gen 28^{12}. The comments by Philo on that passage occurring in *De Somniis* I 12[2] and I 19[3] do not concern us so much as those *ib.* I 22[3], 23, where he maintains that the Jacobs-ladder has both a cosmical and a micro-cosmical (anthropical, sit venia verbo) symbolical connotation. Indeed it is the latter, the anthropical (the modern word 'psychological' would be misleading) that brings us nearest to both the Jn-ine and the Midrashic general sphere of conceptions. It is put forth by Philo as follows:

Philo *De Somniis* I 23: ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐν κόσμῳ λεγομένη συμβολικῶς *κλῖμαξ* τοιαύτη (i. e. as described in I 22) ἐστὶ, τὴν δ' *ἐν ἀνθρώποις* σκοποῦντες εὑρήσομεν τὴν *ψυχήν*, ἧς *βάσις* μὲν τὸ ὡσανεὶ γεῶδές ἐστιν, *αἴσθησις*, *κεφαλὴ* δ'ὡς ἂν τὸ οὐράνιον, ὁ *καθαρώτατος νοῦς*. ἄνω δὲ καὶ κάτω διὰ πάσης αὐτῆς οἱ τοῦ θεοῦ *λ'γοι* χωροῦσιν ἀδιαστάτως, ὁπότε μὲν *ἀνέρχοιντο, συνανασπῶντες αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ διαζευγνύντες* καὶ τὴν θέαν ὧν ἄξιον ὁρᾶν μόνων ἐπιδεικνύμενοι, ὁπότε δὲ *κατέρχοιντο*, οὐ καταβάλλοντες — οὔτε γὰρ θεὸς οὔτε λόγος θεῖος ζημίας αἴτιος —, ἀλλὰ *συγκαταβαίνοντες* διὰ φιλανθρωπίαν καὶ ἔλεον τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν, ἐπικουριάς ἕνεκα καὶ συμμαχίας, *ἵνα καὶ τὴν* ἔτι ὥσπερ *ἐν ποταμῷ, τῷ σώματι, φορουμένην ψυχὴν σωτήριον πνέοντες ἀναζωῶσι.*

---

[1] To Jn the narrative of Jacob's dream would probably present itself as a prophecy of the real angelic ladder between heaven and earth in the son of man (cf. 5_{39}).

[2] Philo *De Somniis I 12*. οὐ γὰρ ἀξιῶν ὁ θεὸς εἰς αἴσθησιν ἔρχεσθαι τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ λόγους ἐπικουρίας ἕνεκα τῶν φιλαρέτων ἀποστέλλει. »God, not condescending to come (down) to the (earthly) sense(s) (perceiving faculty of earthly man) sends his λόγοι to take care of those who love virtue», cf. Estlin Carpenter *JWr* p. 366.

[3] *Vide* Grill, *Unters.* I, p. 128 f.

The Philonic passage explicitly refers to the Jacob's-ladder as a symbol of a spiritual process that may be brought about in ordinary man. Naturally, from the standpoint of the Philomi thought, the λόγος cannot be the 'object' of the ascent-descent of the λόγοι.

The only parallel in Jewish writings to this feature of Jn 15^{1}, is the mystical conception of Metatron as himself *being* the Jacobs-ladder of communication between heaven and earth, in the sense of the salvation-mysticism. But this conception is not attested in the early mystical writings.[1]

The Mandæan parallels also contain no similar feature. (Vide below p. 42.)

(2) The connotation of the term υ. τ. α. here is, however, not constitutively defined only by the *essentiality* of the Son of Man in the symbolical use of the picture of the Jacob's-ladder. Thus it would wrong to deduce from this, that the symbol is applied *exclusively* to the Son of Man. *Exclusivity* is *not* the import of the term υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

That this is so will be apparent from a consideration of the following traits of the Jn-ine representation, viz.

(a) on one hand the δόξα, or celestial appearance, of the λόγος, is, acc. to 1^{14}, beheld as a δόξα ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ *πατρός* (b) the δόξα of the υἱός is a δόξα that he possessed πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι (17^{5}), but on the other hand (c) just as God is glorified in the Son of Man (13^{31}) those who believe in him can say: ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν 1^{16} (d) so the Son is glorified in the believers (δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς 17^{10}) and (e) through his glorification — his union of the celestial with the terrestrial — and thereby his unification of the terrestrial with the 'Father', the same process is brought about in the believers, so that the unity between the 'Father and Himself' should »at last include the believers»[2]: ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me (17^{21}).

---

[1] *Vide* the writer's *3 En. Introd.* sect. 13, H 3.

[2] E. Carpenter, *JWr* p. 356.

There is, as will be repeatedly set forth in the following discourses, an *inclusive* connotation of the term υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Jn. This inclusiveness refers on one side to the Father, on the other to the believers (or, in one vein, to the world), and, to use the expressions now familiar, is both that of an ἀνάβασις and that of a κατάβασις, i. e. may be seen both in the working of the Father, the Son's doing his Father's work, the Son's work being related to the believers (the world; cf. esp. 5^{17-21}) and in the aspiration — the ascent in spiritual perception — of the believers to the Son, and in him, to the Father (cf. esp. $13^{6,7}$).

It will be maintained in the course of the present discourses, that the inclusiveness of the υ. τ. α.-term *applies to all the passages where it occurs,* and, moreover, that this inclusiveness is *intentionally* meant to be conveyed whereever the term is used.

Now it may be surmised, that also in 1^{51} there is an intentional allusion to the said inclusive aspect, that is to say, that the promise contained in 1^{51} really implies a *promise to the believers of a spiritual experience of the kind expressed in the terms of the ascent and descent of the angels from the open heaven on earthly man.* Or, in other words, that the perception (ὄψεσθε) of the glorification of the Son of Man implies the partaking of the spiritual communion with the heavenly world through the celestial hierarchy that is brought about in him. We have already had occasion to state, that the promise of the 'vision' does not refer to a particular happening as the object of the vision, but to the development of a specific subjective perceiving faculty in the believer. Suggestive is the choice of the verb ὁράω, which in Jn, as Abbott[1] has shown, always refers to the spiritual sight, the spiritual perception. The faculty of spiritual perception, again, in Jn, presupposes the entrance into the spiritual reality; the ὄψεσθε of 1^{51} is most naturally connected in the preceding with 1^{18} [θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενής θεὸς ... ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο] and in the sequel with 6^{46} and $14^{7,9}$ e. a. (Cf. 3^{3} and 3^{5} ἰδεῖν-εἰσελθεῖν).

[On the 'open heaven' of 1^{51} *vide* below in the discourse on the 'Gate of Heaven' in excursus to 10^{9}.]

---

[1] *Joh. Voc.* pp. 110, 111: only the future ὄψομαι and the perfect ἑώρακα are used. Cf. Abbott's note *op. cit.* p. 111^{1}.

The nearest Mandæan parallels to the conception of 151 are perhaps the passages in *GR* treating of the communion that is promised the Messenger with his Celestial Home, when he is sent down from the House of Life to the Lower World.

Thus *GR III*, 68 13—25 (Pet. 72 4—14):

מאליל מאנדא דהייא ואמארלה למאנא רבא כאבירא כדי
באיינאך למאן עהיזיא וכדי אכצאליא על מאן ניהויליא רוחצאנא
תיראת דהיאת מינאיכון על מאהו עסימכה מאליל מאנא בראבותא
ולמאנדא דהייא דנימארלה אנאת מינאן לאתיפסיק ואנין לואתאך
אנין כול דאנאת אמרית לקודאמאן תריץ ואנאת לואתאן
מיתקאימית ומן לואתאן לאתיפסיק ואנין לואתאך אנין דהייא
עלאך בטאבותא עתמלין ואדיאוריא נצאבלאך עותריא
ניהיא ומקאימיא עותריא ניהיא ומקאימיא דניהולאך אדיאוריא
תוב נצאבולאך אדיאוריא עותריא ניהיא ומקאימיא דהינון
ניתקאימון בנאך דהאתאב בנאך ניקרון קאלא דהייא

»Manda dHayye said to the Great mighty mānā: 'When I shall seek thee, whom shall I perceive? And when I shall be in distress, in whom shall I put my trust? My Inmost, that was with you, on what shall I support it? The Mānā answered in Greatness and said to Manda dHayye: '*Thou shalt not be severed from us;* we shall be with thee; all that thou sayest is erected (stands firm) before us; *thou art established with us* and shalt not be severed from us. And we are with thee, for the Life is filled with favour towards thee. It procured (created) for thee Helpers, it created for thee quiet (mild) and firm Uthras[1], quiet and firm Uthras, that they might be Helpers for thee. Then it (the Life) *created for thee Helpers, quiet and firm Uthras,* that they might be established there (i. e. in the Lower World) as thy children. Thy children shall make heard the voice of the Life.»

GR XV p. 316 28 ff. (Pet. 314 11 ff.)

לאתיהוק ולאתיתאזהא ולאניהתארהאז מאנא דבאך
. . . ולאתימאר דבאלהודאי אנא עהאבילאך אדיאוריא דכושטא
. . . כדי כאברא עלאך בישותא קאלאן דילאן ניתיא עלאך . . .
כדי ראגזיא ברוגזא רבא ענגאר כושטא מן קודאמאך דילאך
ניתיא עלאן נישאדארלאך אשגאנדא ואנין ניהוילאך נאטרא . . .

---

[1] Uthras = angels.

(Pet. 3154) ניהוילון שרארא לתארמידאך דדאיריא בדאוריא באטלא
ניתריהצון ברוהצאנאך ומן שובא ניתפארקון ניתפארקון מן שובא
וטאביתאן דילאן ודילאך ניליגטון נאציראייא דשיהיא שיהיא
אנאת היבין סאהדא אנאת סאהדא היבון ובהאילאך דילאך
ניסקון לאתאר נהור

(The Life speaks to the Messenger *Sam-Ziua:*) »Do not tremble, and do not be afraid or affrighted and the Mana that is in thee may not be vexed . . . and do not say: 'I am alone'. I gave thee faithful Helpers (Helpers of Kušṭa) . . . When the Evil (the Wickedness) shall be heavy on thee, then *our voice will come to thee*[1] . . . when (the Evil Ones, or the 'Seven') shall be wrath with great wrath, then *a letter of Kušṭa may come from thy place to us*[2], and we shall send thee a messenger and we shall be for the a guardian . . . Thy disciples shall receive firmness, (those who) abide in the transient (perishable, worthless) abode. They will have trust (security, faith) through thy trust and be delivered from the Seven (i. o. the Rulers of the World of Darkness = this world). They shall be delivered from the Seven and render us and thee gratitude for it (= the deliverance). For the Naṣoræans that are ardent be thou a witness, be thou a witness for them, and *through thy power they shall ascend to the Place of Light.*»

There is no parallel in Mandæan literature to the essentiality of the Son of Man, since there are there a plurality of messenger-saviours. It might, however, be maintained, that the *function* of, or the *Celestial Power inherent* in, every messenger from the 'Life' has that characteristic. On the other hand the Enoš-Saviour, the Original Man, as the 'representative sum' of all the Spirits, self-evidently in his communion with and ascent to the First Life includes the spirits who are saved in him. In the same vein the latter of the examples given above enunciates of the messenger *Sam-Ziua: »through thy power* they (the Believers) shall ascend to the Place of Light». Cf. quotations given below on 3 13.

---

[1] = κατάβασις!

[2] = ἀνάβασις!

$2^{(24)25}$ *διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας, καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ,* »because he knew[1] all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man». That Christ »knows the secrets of eternal life and shares the divine knowledge of what was in man»[2], that he »possesses supernatural, divine knowledge», is a fundamental idea of Jn, underlying the whole gospel, and playing an important part in the Johannine demonstration of Jesus as the celestial man and Divine being.[3] The knowledge possessed by Christ may been seen under four aspects, viz.:

(1) *Prescience*, and this an unlimited one: he knows everything beforehand, in detail and 'from the beginning' (i. e. not partly nor by manner of a successive revelation). For the prescience of Jesus, *vide* esp. 2^{4} $7^{6,8}$ 13^{1} (he knows his ὥρα, hour, or καιρός, time i. e. the time of his death and glorification[4]), $2^{19.21}$ (knows his death and resurrection), 3^{14} (»knows what 'being uplifted' means»[1]), 6^{64} (knew from the beginning who they were that believed not and who should betray him) 13^{38} the threefold betrayal by Petrus); 13^{36} (the future fate of Petrus: 'whither I go thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards') cf. $21^{18,19}$; 21^{22} (the fate of the beloved disciple); $4^{21,23}$ (the future in general). For *prescience in detail,* »everything», vide 18^{4}: Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἰδὼς πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ' αὐτόν, knowing all things that should come upon him. For *prescience 'from the very beginning'*, vide 6^{64}: ᾔδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . .

(2) *Knowledge of 'all things'*, 'all secrets' *celestial and terrestrial:* $1^{48,50}$ 3^{12} [notice especially the contraposition of τὰ ἐπίγεια and τὰ ἐπουράνια, 'earthly things and heavenly things] $4^{16-18,29,50,52}$ 16^{30} [οἶδας πάντα]; In his knowledge of the 'celestial things', the spiritual realities, the Divine truth, he is identified with that Divine truth: 14^{6} [ἐγώ εἰμι . . . ἡ ἀλήθεια].

(3) *Knowledge of 'what is in man':* 2^{25}, cf. 1^{42} (of Simon) 1^{47} (of Nathanael: a true Israelite) 4^{1-31} (of the Samaritan woman,

---

[1] *Vide* Abbott, *Joh. Voc.* p. 123 rendering: 'could understand'.

[2] E. Carpenter, *JWr* p. 354.

[3] Grill *Unters.* ii 49.

[4] Grill *Unters.* i 43, Bauer *JEv* p. 42.

the object of Jn being to show how J reads the woman's mind, *besides* knowing *about* her without having received earthly information, vs 17—19, 29) 5^{42} (ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς) 16^{61} (εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὅτι γογγύζουσιν, knew im himself that his disciples murmured) 21^{17} (knows »what is in» Petrus, πάντα σὺ οἶδας, σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε: thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee).

The omniscience of Jesus acc. to Jo will not be fully characterized until still another trait of the conception shall have been brought into light, viz.

(4) *his omniscience,* his knowledge, are *wholly derived from his Father* (in close conjunction with the derivation of all his *doings* from those of His Father); four passages illustrate the import of this aspect: ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐδίδαξέν με ὁ πατήρ, ταῦτα λαλῶ 8^{28}; ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστιν; τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ· ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ 14^{10}; νῦν οἄδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα ... ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες 16^{30}, ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λαλῶ 8^{38} cf. 7^{17} (As the Father taught me, I speak these things; the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works; now we are sure that *thou knowest all things ... by this we believe that thou camest forth from God;* what I have beheld with my Father, that I speak).

In Rabbinical literature there is no parallel to the present passage: Billerbeck *ad locum* points out how acc. to *Mek* to Ex 16^{32} *(20 a)* seven things are hidden from the children of man. The passage runs

שבעה דברים מכוסין מבני אדם ואלו הן יום המיתה ויום
הנחמה ועומק הדין ואין אדם יודע במה משתכר ואין אדם יודע
מה בלבו של חבירו ומלכות בית דוד אימתי תחזור למקומה
ומלכות חייבת אימתי תעקר

(seven things are hidden ...): (1) the day of death (2) the day of consolation, scil. in the future world, (3) the depth of the Judgement, and (4) no man knows his coming reward nor (5) *what is in the heart of his neighbour,* (6) and the Kingdom of the House of David, when it will be restored to its place, and (7) the guilty Kingdom (Rome) when it will be rooted up (i. e. destroyed cf. Zeph 2^4) *Gen. R. 65* and *Eccl. R.* to 11^5 give as scriptural support for man's not knowing what is in the heart of another the passage of Jer 17^{10}: »I, the Lord, search the heart», thereby indicating also, that the knowledge of what is in man is the exclusive prerogative of the Holy One[1] he alone being called, *T. B. Sanh* 37 b: *ha-yyōđe$^{a^{c}}$ maḥ^{a}šābōp:* the knower of thoughts. Billerbeck remarks: »wird daher von Jesus Joh. 2 25 gesagt: ,αὐτός γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ' so wird er damit an Gottes Seite gerückt».

It may be noticed that all those different fields of knowledge enumerated in the Rabbinical dictum as excluded from the knowledge of man are, by Jn, attributed to Jesus: the time of death, the time of consolation (corresponding in Jn to glorification and Life) the judgement (5 22. 27 16 8, 12, — the ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κέκριται is really = »the depth of Judgement» cf. 12 31), the Messianic time the destruction of the world power (in Jn the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου is, of course, taken in a different sense from the Rabbinic view of Rome; the conception of the invisible ruler called the 'Prince of Rome' in Jewish mystical literature, however, is quite closely related to the Johannine conception of the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, cf. below on 16 11).

Although Rabbinical literature knows of no being prossessing the Divine faculty of seeing what is in man, there is an important and very close parallel to the present Johannine representation in the Jewish mystical conception of *Metatron*. Thus a chapter in *3 Enoch*, contains the following tradition which in all probability is not later than the second century, and partly earlier:

גלה לי הקב"ה מאז [or: מעין] כל סתרי תורה וכל רזי חכמה
וכל עמקי תורה תמימה וכל מחשבות לבבות של בריות וכל רזי
עולם וכל רזי בראשית גלוין לפני כדרך שגלוין לפני יוצר בראשית.
וצפיתי מאוד להסתכל ברזי עמוקה ובסוד מופלא קודם שיחשוב
האדם במסתר אני רואה וקודם שיעשה אדם דבר אני רואה ואין
דבר במרום ובעומק עולם נעלם ממני. (*3 Enoch* 11)

'The Holy one, blessed be He, revealed to me (Metatron) from that time (or better: from the beginning) all the mysteries of *Tora* and all the secrets of Wisdom and all the depths of the Perfect *Tora* (Ps. 19 8); and all the thoughts of the hearts of the created (beings) and all the secrets of the universe and all the secrets of the Creation were revealed before me in the way in which they are revealed before the Maker of Creation. (And I watched intently to behold the secrets of the depth and the wonderful mystery.) Before a man did think in secret, I saw (his thought) and before a man made a thing I beheld it. And there was no thing on high nor in the depth of the world hidden from me. (One Ms has: Before a man did think, I knew what was in his thought, and there was no thing on high nor below in the deep hidden from me.)

---

[1] Billerbeck ii 412. Cf. Act 15 8 ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεός (ib 1 24).

Here, thus, it is explicitly stated, that *Metatron knows 'what is in man'*, that he is a 'knower of thoughts' and 'a knower of hearts' (καρδιογνώστης).

The parallel between the cited representation of Metatron, who is called *the little Yahvé* (*3 En* 12^{5}) but intentionally not *'Son of Man'*, and the Johannine representation of the omniscience of Jesus is, however, to be pursued further.

(1) Apart from the remarkable assignment to Metatron of knowledge of 'what is in man', it is to be noticed (2) that Metatron, according to the original intent of the fragment, possesses his knowledge, and insight 'מאז', = from of old, *'from the beginning'*, just as Jesus, acc. to 6^{64} knows ἐξ ἀρχῆς. The מאז cf. 3 En 1 is most probably an allusion to Prov 8^{22} where Wisdom speaks of itself: *YHU̯H qānāni rēšip darkō qa'đæm mif'ālāu̯ mē'āz*, »the Lord begat me as the beginning of this way, the antecedent of His works, of old»[1], and is equivalent to the מן ריש of the targumic rendering.[2] The Metatron conception had from the very first been amalgamated with the Wisdom-speculation, although this amalgation did not, as far we are able to detect from the earliest preserved sources, actually take the form of the assertion that Metatron *is* the Wisdom of God[3]; (3) Metatron has an *unlimited prescience:* he knows the thoughts and deeds of men *before* they are thought or done, and *nothing* is hidden from him; cf. above on the Johannine representation of the unlimited prescience of J. (4) The knowledge possessed by Metatron is repeatedly set forth in relation te the two realms of existence expressed by the terms *'celestial'*

---

[1] Burney's rendering in »*Christ as the APXH of Creation*», *JThSt* xxvii (1926) p. 168.

[2] Cf. *op. cit.* p. 169. That *qānāni* of Prov 8^{22} equals: 'created me' may be seen *Gen. R. 1 5*, and *'mĕ'āz'* = 'from the beginning' *Gen. R. 1 11*.

[3] The identification, or rather, submersion of the personified Wisdom into Metatron may be expressed somewhat as follows: the personified side of Wisdom, the hypostasis, *'created* in the beginning' was identified with the 'person' of Metatron; the Wisdom *qua* Wisdom *'possessed* in the Beginning' was then made a 'possession' of Metatron.

(Hebrew: *ʿælyōn, ʿælyōnim*) and *'terrestrial'* (Hebrew: *taḥtōn, taḥtōnim*), the 'secrets of the celestial beings (i. e. world) and the terrestrial beings (i. e. world) = secrets of above and below: 3 En 10^{5} $11^{1,3}$ 48 C 4; cf. the Johannine contrast between 'above' and' below', i. e. the heavenly or spiritual and the earthly or physical where τὰ ἐπίγεια and τὰ ἐπουράνια of 3^{12} correspond with the *rāzē taḥtonim* and *rāzē ʿælyonim* of *3 En* 48 C 4 cf. further ἄνωθεν or ἐϰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ v. ἐϰ τῆς γῆς: 3^{31} ἐϰ τῶν ἄνω v. ἐϰ τῶν ϰάτω, ἐϰ τούτου τοῦ ϰόσμου v. οὔϰ ἐϰ τοῦ ϰόσμου τούτου: 8^{23} and the repeated reference to Christ's *knowledge* of the 'things above', but also of the inner reasons and workings of 'this world', the fate of the prince of this world. (5) the wisdom, omniscience, prescience, knowledge of Metatron is *wholly derived from His Creator (qōnæ);* it is the Holy One who reveals all secrets to him; *3 En* 11^{1}; at the same time Metatron possesses *all* the wisdom of his Creator: *(Qōnæ):* the secrets 'were revealed unto me even as they are revealed unto the maker of Creation' (3 En 11^{1}), the Holy one says, acc. to *3 En* 48 C 7: *'every* secret did I reveal to him (scil. Metatron) *as a father*'; The characterization of the Johannine representation of the 'vollkommene Spiegelung des Bewusstseinsinhalts des Vaters in demjenigen des Sohns'[1] can thus be used as a characterization of the Jewish mystical representation of the relation between the Holy One and Metatron. One may even point to the accompanying feature of the functions, i. e. ἔργα, of Metatron as a reflexion of the ἔργα of the *Qādōš b. h.* appearing in *3 En* 48 C 9^{10}[2] (cf. especially vs. 10: 'every word that proceeds from the Holy One ... Metatron carries it out').

In Mandæan literature the Messenger-Saviour is frequently represented as instructed in all the mysteries of the Celestial World by the Life, his Father, or by His 'Parents', and also occasionally in the secrets of the Lower World: *cf. e.g. GR* 381 (*Pet* 360), *GR* 74 (*Pet* 76). On the other hand, the Messenger-Saviour, reascended to the celestial worlds, possesses greater knowledge of the Lower Worlds than his Parents, the Life and its Image. Thus acc. to *GR* $164^{17\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* $153^{18\text{ f.}}$), Hibil-Ziu̯a says to his parents: 'The mysteries that I have seen, I will reveal to you and instruct you in all of them! The Messenger is not particularly emphasized as ϰαρδιογνώστης. Cf. *GR* XVI 4.

---

[1] Grill, *Unters.* i 86^{2}.

[2] *Vide* the writers *3 En* pp. 169—171.

3 5 **ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.** What does the expression ἐζ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος mean? The question may here be put forth, whether the 'water' is necessarily to be taken as an allusion to baptism. To decide this, it will be well to begin by considering the context. Then it may be suggested that the import of the γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος can not be essentially different from the γεννηθῆναι ἐκ πνεύματος referred to in vs. 6. One may even venture the hypothesis, that γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος is identical in sense with the γεννηθῆναι ἐκ πνεύματος. The whole context, it may be furthered be considered, views the γεννηθῆναι ἐκ πνεύματος with a strong emphasis on the contrast between the two worlds of spirit and flesh, this contrast put on a par with the contrasts τὰ ἐπουράνια v. τὰ ἐπίγεια (vs. 12) ἄνω v. κάτω, the celestial-spiritual reality v. the terrestrial-physical reality, ὁ οὐρανός v. ὁ κόσμος. Thus the expression ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος should be put in contraposition to its corresponding contrasting expression. The contrast from the terrestrial realm corresponding to the ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος is to be found in Nicodemus' reference to the terrestrial birth in speaking of the εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γεννηθῆναι. The words that here correspond to the ὕδωρ are εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν . . . δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν, for the right understanding of which it must be emphasized, that δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν does not mean 'return to', but 'enter a second time' i.e. the simile is not that of an involution, but of a repetition of the evolution of birth, or in other words, what is to enter a second time is not the child that has once been born, but the semen that is to give birth to the child. The argument of Nicodemus, acc. to Jn., is this: one must be born again from above, from the celestial world, you say; how can that be done in the case of one already born? how can the process be repeated and a man enter into his mother's womb again as a semen from above, as a celestial semen? The answer given is: verily, it is as you say, the process must be repeated, for that which is born from a sarcical semen remains sarcical, can never in itself become spirit, and that which is to become spirit must be born spiritually from a spiritual semen. This, it may be suggested, is the real sense of ἐξ ὕδατος

καὶ πνεύματος: the ὕδωρ is that which in the spiritual process corresponds to the semen in the sarcical process. From this interpretation the intent of what follows in vss. 8—12 becomes clear: μὴ θαυμάσῃς ὅτι εἶπόν σοι· δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν. τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει. οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, that is: marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again; the birth of the spirit is not a repetition of the sarcical process, where you know πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει; that which gives rise to the spiritual birth comes you know not whence, from a world, a reality, you do not know, and the birth itself does not take place in the terrestrial world but in the spiritual, celestial, world, a world you do not know (by own experience) but of which I can speak, for I know it and have seen it, having myself come from that world (ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν cf. vs. 13 ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς). The section is concluded by the statement, that the whole matter of which has been spoken belongs to the ἐπουράνια, the heavenly things: εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς ἐὰν εἴπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύσετε; the entire exposition of the section moves in the same sphere of ideas and uses the same contrasts as 1¹³: οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν (cf. 1 Cor. 15 50 σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύναται, οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ).

Is there any foundation for the interpretation of ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος as forming a contrast to semen and σάρξ? Some illustrations bearing on this question may be brought from the Rabbinical and Jewish-mystical uses of the words טיפה 'drop', and מים 'water'. Classical are the following passages[1]: *TB Nid* 16 b: דרש ר' חנינא בר פפא אותו מלאך הממונה על ההריון לילה שמו ונוטל טיפה ומעמידה לפני הקב"ה ואומר לפניו רבש"ע טיפה זו מה תהא עליה גבור או חלש חכם או טיפש עשיר או עני ואלו רשע או צדיק לא קאמר כדרבי חנינא דאמר רבי חנינא הכל בידי שמים חוץ מיראת שמים.

»R. Hanina bar Pappa (3rd gen. Pal. Amor.) expounded: the angel that is appointed over the conception is called Laila and he takes the טיפה (semen) and brings it before the Holy one, and says before him: »Lord of the Universe! what shall arise out of this σπέρμα? a strong man or a weak man, a wise or a fool, a rich or a poor?» and if the words »a righteous or a wicked» are not included in the question, this is in accord with R. Ḥanina's opinion, for R. Ḥanina used to say: 'Everything is in the hands of Heaven except the fear of Heaven'» (*TB Ber.* 33 b, *Meg.* 25 a) The physical and intellectual properties of man and even his external fate are potentially extant already in the σπέρμα, whereas the moral, or spiritual, qualities are not given in the σπέρμα.

---

[1] Cf. Levy s. v.

Pirqē 'Aḇōṯ 3[1] 'Aqaḇya ben Mah^{a}lal'el (1st. gen. Tann., contemporary of R. Gamliel the elder, the teacher of Paulus) said: דע מאין באתה מטיפה סרוחה »Know whence thou camest: from a fetid drop (Ch. Taylor 56, 57)».

The dictum intends to convey the lowly, earthly, one may say 'sarcical', origin of man and approaches the Jn-ine »that which is born of flesh is flesh». By the side of this may be put *GenR* 46 2, where the reason why Abraham circumcized himself at the age of 99 years (with reference to Gen. 17[24]) is given thus: »כדי שיצא יצחק מטיפה קדושה: in order that Isaac should go forth from *a holy* טיפה». The last dictum, thus, affirms, that the quality of holiness may be inherent in the טיפה. This seems to imply a determination of the nature of the one who is to be born, in the sense »that which is born of a holy טיפה is holy» especially when considered in the light of *TB Nidda* 16 b cited above.[1]

The earliest occurrence of טיפה in Jewish-mystical Hebrew texts is 3 En 6[2], in a context relating Enoch's elevation into the highest heaven and his transformation into a celestial being; the highest beings in the celestial hierarchy are there represented as objecting to Enoch's entrance into the highest heaven, with these words: »What smell [one reading has: what *spirit*] of a woman-born is this and what taste of a white drop[2] (drop of semen) that ascends to the high heavens?» There is a word-play in the latter clause, giving the double-meaning: »what is the reason that a white drop ascends to the high heavens?». [מה ריה ילוד אשה ומה טעם טיפת לבן שהיא עולה למרום.] The idea is that one born of a woman and a drop of semen from the terrestrial world has no right to enter the highest realm of the celestial world: does not belong there. (The βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ corresponds with the ערבות רקיע of 3 Enoch). Cf. also 3 En. 48 D 7.[1] The term מים is connected with engendering functions already at an early time. 1 En. 54 8[2] has: »and all the waters shall be joined with the waters: that which is above the heaven is the masculine, and the water which is beneath the earth is the feminine». The upper waters, basing upon Gen. 1 7, are in Rabbinic termed מים עליונים and also מים זכרים (the celestial water, resp. the male water). The idea of fructification by the celestial water is of course applied to the fructifying properties of the rain; but the speculation upon the upper water is no more restricted to the literal meaning of the word than the Johannine πνεῦμα is restricted to the sense of 'wind' attested in 3 8. On the contrary, the mystical speculation used the literal meanings merely as illustrations for the spiritual laws they desired to convey, just as does Jn. 3 8 when speaking of the πνεῦμα= 'wind', to illustrate a property of the 'spirit'.

---

[1] On the supposition that Nicodemus, or the particular kind of Jewish mind that Jn 3 has in view and which is represented by Nicodemus, moved in somewhat the same sphere of thoughts as those appearing in the Rabbinical dicta selected here, his arguments might be presented in approximately the following vein: we are taught that man's entering the kingdom of Heaven depends on his manner of living, whether he lives as a righteous or as a wicked (*TB Nidda* 16 b), but granted that you are right, in saying that one must be born from above in order to enter the Kingdom above, hence that no one who is not born of a holy semen can become holy, then there is no sense in your requesting us who are not, according to your word, born of a holy semen. to be born from on high; for how can we, who are already born, become a semen again and enter our mother's womb a second time?»

[2] *Cit.*: drop of white (liquid).

That this is so may be judged from *TY Ta'an.* 64 b, *GenR* 13 13, 14:

מה טעם תהום אל תהום קורא לקול צנוריך וגו': א"ר לוי המים העליונים זכרים והתחתונים נקבות והן אומרים אלו לאלו קבלו אותנו אתם בריותיו של הקב"ה ואנו שלוחיו מיד הם מקבלים אותן. הה"ד תפתח ארץ כנקבה זו שהיא פותחת לזכר ויפרו ישע שהן פרין ורבין וצדקה יצמיח יחד זו ירידת גשמים. אני ה' בראתיו לכך בראתיו לתקונו של עולם ולישובו:

»What is the meaning of Ps. 48 7 'Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of the waterspouts' etc.? R. Levi (3rd gen. Pal. Am.) said: '(this is the explanation:) The celestial waters are male and the lower waters are female'. The former said to the latter: 'receive us! you are creations of the Holy One, blessed be He, and we are his messengers (outflow, issue). Immediately the latter received the former. This is (implied, alluded to in) the word Isa 45^8 'let the earth open' (*quā* female) .... 'and let them bring forth salvation' for they were fruitful and multiplied, 'and let righteousness spring up together', that refers to the descent of the rain, 'I the Lord have created it', for this purpose I created it viz. for the preparation (bringing in order) and habitation of the world.» What is conveyed under the simile of or behind the interpretation referring to the fructifying property of the rain coming down from heaven, is the life-giving power of the outflow from God's world to the world of man. Cf. the benediction, recorded *i. a. TY Taʿaniþ ib* אלף אלפים אנו חייבין להודות לשמך מלכינו על כל טיפה וטיפה שאת מוריד לנו שאת עומל טובה לחייבים 'we are in duty bound thousand times thousand times to praise thy name, o, our King, for every drop (טיפה) that thou bringest down to us for thou bestowest good upon the guilty (cf. *TY Ber.* 14 a; Mt. 5^{45}: he sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust). On the 'celestial waters' or the מים as 'primæval waters' there were cosmological speculations current, some of which were attributed to R. Išmaʿel (*TY. Ḥag.* 77 a), that is: they were a constituent part of the מעשי בראשית, the mystery of creation; but they were also a part of the mystery of the spiritual world, the מעשי מרכבה, and to the latter sphere of speculations does the use of the term מים to denote a spiritual or Divine engendering efflux belong.[1]

---

[1] In the earliest Jewish mystical writings the birth, or 'creation' (rise of life) in the celestial world is spoken of in the terms of the Divine word creating (generating) out of the 'river of fire', the 'fire' being the celestial ὕλη. Vide *3 En* 15, 35, 47.

[2] Vide R. H. Charles, *1 En²*, note *ad loc.*

GenR 2 6 *TY. Ḥag.* ii 77 a b

א"ל [ר'ש בן זומא לר' יהושע] מסתכל הייתי במעשי בראשית. ולא היה בין מים העליונים למים התחתונים אלא כשתים ושלש אצבעות. ורוח אלהים מנשבת אכ"כ אלא מרחפת כעוף הזה שהוא מרפרף בכנפיו ובנפיו נוגעות ואינן נוגעות.

R. Šimʿon ben Zoma (known for his mystical propensities) when once questioned by R. Jošuaʿ, answered him: I was meditating upon the mysteries of Creation. (And I found that) there was not between the Upper (celestial) and Lower Waters more than two or three fingers' breadth. For it is not written: 'and the Spirit of the Lord was blowing', but (and the spirit of the Lord was) 'brooding', i.e. as a bird that shakes its wings (so near to the water that) one moment they are touching (it) and the other moment they are not touching it.[1]

---

[1] The cosmological and the 'spiritual' significances of the מים must not be confused; that is probably the meaning of the difficult and differently interpreted dictum *TB Ḥag 14 b*: R ʿAqiba said to his three companions in mystical expriences: 'when yow arrive at the stones of pure alabaster do not say: water, water! (i.e. do not introduce the laws of cosmical beginnings into your experiences of the highest spiritual, celestial realms).

In this dictum association between Spirit and Water may be noticed. The close proximity of the Upper and Lower Waters was most probably understood in the sense of the engendering function of the former in relation to the latter. The use of the simile of a 'bird' for the Spirit may have some significance (cf. Jn 1^{32}).

There are also traces of a conception regarding the lower waters (or the תהום) as representing the evil, especially in association with 'darkness', in contrast to the upper waters as representing the seed of celestial nature, associated with light. Since the corresponding terms occur in Gen 1^{1-8}, these speculations were easily deduced from that scriptural section. In this connexion one may also notice the intermingling of or parallelism between the contrasts of cosmos and celestial world on the one hand and of evil (i.e. sarcical) and good (i.e. celestial or spiritual) in man. Hence the *'spirit' associated with the celestial 'water'* and 'moving upon' the lower water *represents* the salvation of man, or *the celestial in man.* In such contexts there enters, beside the antitheses Heaven v. Earth, Light v. Darkness, Good v. Evil, also the contrast Life v. Death.

GenR 2_5:

R. Šimʿon ben Lāqiš (2nd gen. Pal. Am.) connected the words 'תהו' 'בהו' 'חשך' and 'תהום' of Gen 1^{2} midrashically with the four evil world powers. The dictum ends:

מה התהום הזה אין לו חקר אף הרשעים כן ורוח אלהים
מרחפת זה רוחו של מלך המשיח היאך מד"א ונחה עליו רוח ה'

---

[1] In *TY Ḥag* 77 b this is explained from Deut. 32^{11}: »As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, (spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings)», where the word rendered »fluttereth» (יְרַחֵף) is the same which is used in Gen 1_2 (רוח אלהים מרחפת) Just as the word in Deut 32^{11} denotes the fluttering of the bird immediately above her nest, one moment touching it and another not touching it, so the word in Gen 1^2 must be interpreted as picturing a similar relation between the Spirit and the Water.

באיזו זכות ממשמשש ובאה המרחפת על פני המים בזכות התשובה שנמשלה כמים שנאמר שפכי כמים לבך.

»Just as this *t^ehōm* is without reckoning so are also the wicked. 'And the spirit of God moved': this refers to the Spirit of King Messiah. By what reason did it approach and come down[1] (to the lower world)? (answer:) »moved upon the waters». By reason of the repentance (the returning to God); for repentance is likened unto water, as it is written (Lam 2^{19}: pour out thine heart like water!).» *Ib* 2^4 and 2^7 Light v. תהו ובהו [resp. Darkness] is identified with »the Deeds of the Righteous» v. »the Deeds of the Wicked». Cf. below on Jn 3^{19-21}. *GenR* 2_2 in a dictum attributed to R. Y^ehuða bar Simon (4th gen. Pal. Am.). »The Earth is said to have been תהו ובהו for the Celestial were *Living* but the Terrestrials were *Dead*.»[3] (Cf. the dictum: man was made from the Celestial and the Terrestrial, *GenR* 8_{11} 12_7 14_3).

In the present connexion reference may be made to *TB Ḥag* 12 b, speaking of the contents of the 7th, or highest, heaven:

ערבות שבו צדק ומשפט וצדקה גנזי חיים וגנזי שלום וגנזי ברכה ונשמתן של צדיקים ורוחות ונשמות שעתיד להיבראות וטל שעתיד הקב"ה להחיות בו מתים

»'Arābōþ, [the highest heaven], in which are [contained, the meaning is: where is the source of] Right and Judgement and Mercy, the treasures of Life and the treasures of Peace and the treasures of blessing, and the spirits of the righteous and the souls and spirits that are to be created [in the future], and *the dew*[4] by

---

[1] The commentary מתנות כהונה explains: 'כלו' מקרבת ורוחשת ובא הגאולה making 'the salvation' logical subject.

[2] *Yalquṭ* 4, reproducing the dictum of *GenR* 2_5, has an interesting addition: ד"א ורוח אלהים זה רוחו של אדם הראשון דכתיב אחור וקדם צרתני אחור למעשה יום אחרון וקדם למעשה יום א' »another interpretation: 'and *the spirit of God*', that refers to *the spirit of the First Man*, as it is written 'thou hast formed me before and after', viz. 'after' the work of the second day and 'before' the work of the first day. The spirit of the First Man existing before the Creation is evidently the (Spirit of the) Original Man who is here associated with the Spirit of the Messiah, or the Saviour.

[3] חיים 'living' and מתים 'dead' are probably to be taken in the sense of 'immortal' and 'mortal' ἀθάνατοι and θνητοί. For 'Life'='Eternal Life' and 'Death' ='Mortality, Perishableness' vide below on 8^{51}.

[4] Cf. *Odes of Solomon* 4^{10}: »Distil thy dews upon us; and open thy rich fountains ...» (v. below on $4^{11\text{ ff.}}$ and R. Harris, *Odes and Psalms of Solomon* ii p. 227).

which the Holy one shall [in the future] *make living the dead*». As scriptural support for the conception Ps. 68 is given: »Thou, o God, didst send a plentiful rain, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance when it was weary».

Similarly *T.Y. Ta'ᵃn* I 63 d:

כך אמר לו הקב"ה לאליהו לך והתר נדרו של טל שאין המתים חיים אלא בטללים ואני מחיה בנה של צרפית. Thus said the Holy One to Elijah ('with reference to 1 Ki 17[17, 21]) 'Go and absolve the vow of the dew' (that is Elijah's vow before Ahab: 'there shall not be dew nor rain these years' acc. to 1 Ki 17'), for the dead cannot be made living except by dews[1]: then I will make the son of the widow of Zaraphath living. The same *TY* tractate in the following repeatedly refers to the גבורות גשמים בתחיית המתים.

A Bāraiþā *ib.* runs:

לא שאל בברכת השנים או שלא הזכיר גבורות גשמים בתחיית המתים.

Before proceeding to Non-Jewish paralleles, it may be well to refer to two Philonic passages, bearing upon the present ideas:

Philo. *Leg. Alleg.* I 31 p. 49 on Gen 27 Διττὰ ἀνθρώπων γένη· ὁ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν *οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος*, ὁ δὲ *γήινος*. ὁ μὲν οὖν *οὐράνιος* ἅτε *κατ᾽ εἰκόνα θεοῦ* γεγονὼς φθαρτῆς καὶ συνόλως γεώδους οὐσίας ἀμέτοχος, ὁ δὲ *γήϊνος ἐκ σποράδος* ὕλης, ἣν χοῦν κέκληκεν, ἐπάγη.

Philo *De Opif. Mundi* 134 p. 32 ἐναργέστατα καὶ διὰ τούτου παρίστησιν, ὅτι διαφορὰ παμμεγέθης ἐστὶ τοῦ τε νῦν *πλασθέντος ἀνθρωπου καὶ* τοῦ *κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονότος* πρότερον. ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαπλασθεὶς *αἰσθητὸς* ἤδη μετέχων ποιότητος, *ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστώς*, ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνή, φύσει θνητός. ὁ δὲ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα ἰδέα τις ἢ γένος ἢ σφραγίς, *νοητός, ἀσώματος, οὔτ᾽ ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ, ἄφθαρτος φύσει*.

For the use of the term 'water' to signify a certain engendering efflux of Life, appearing in the Mandaitic literature, the following passages may be considered characteristic.

---

[1] It need scarcely be said that the meaning is not that the physical dew was necessary to make the dead living. But the intent is to convey, that in the vow of the drying up of the dew and rain there must have been implied a vow as to the drying up of the spiritual or celestial dew. i. e. closing it up in heaven, preventing it from being applied to giving life to earthly man. At the same time the physical rain and dew are 'sympathetic' symbols of the spiritual or celestial forces named by the same words.

It may be noticed, that, of the passages given above, *TB Ḥag. 12 b* at least, belongs to a mystical context, and the 'making living the dead' mentioned there in all probability has the same sense as the vivification of the dead in Jn 5[25] (*vide* below on that vs.).

MLi 62^{8} 63^{1}, *Qolasta* xxiii:

מייא אנאתון הייא אנאתון מן אתרא ד̄נפיש אתאיתון ומן בית הייא עשתאפאיתון
מיתיא מיא הייא מן בית הייא ניתון טאביא וניטאיבון

»*Water of Life* you are, *you have come from a sublime place* and *from the House of Life you have been poured out.* With the coming of the Water of Life from the House of Life, the Good will come and be rendered good (receive good).»

MLi 35 *Qolasta* xxii, אודין . . . בפיריאוים כאנא ד̄מיא הייא . . .
בשכינאצאר שאבין דמותא דבית הייא בהייא דאינאיהון במאי גמאט סליק הזא כבא
קינא ד̄מינה̄ הוא ביופין יופאפין בנבאט ניבטא קאדמאיא צוריך הייא

»We confessed . . . Piryau̯is, the receptacle of the Water of Live, Škinaṣar, the founder of the image of the House of Life and the Life that fixed its eyes on the *Water;* it ascended, looked and beheld the nest from which it (had come forth), Yofin Yofafin Nbaṭ, the first sprout, the *efflux of life.*»

MLi 256 f., *Oxf III* 8

קרולה̄ לשירשא ד̄מיא הייא ושיהלויא לאיאר ושאדרויא . . . לשכינאתא ד̄עותריא
כולהון ארהובה̄ עותריא ובסום . . . שתון מינה̄ ורואז . . . ושתיפכאת בליבאיהון
נאצרות

»[the Life] called on the root of the *Water of Life,* and sent (for) the ether and missioned it . . . to the Škinas of all the Uthras: the Uthras smelled it and were filled with delight . . . they drank from it and exulted . . . and the *Naṣruþ* (the Naṣoræan faith, the Naṣoræan life) was infused in their hearts!» The מיא and איאר (air, ether) here may be compared with the ὕδωρ and πνεῦμα respectively of Jn 3^{5}. Further may be observed the function of מיא and איאר in giving rise to, infusing a new character, a new life *(Naṣruþ)* into the *Uthras.* This Naṣruþ may be said to be born of מיא הייא and איאר (corresponding in a certain degree to ὕδωρ and πνεῦμα).

GR $69^{18,19}$ (*Pet* $13^{8,9}$) שיבקויא ליארדנא ד̄מיא הייא ואסגון למיא
תאהמיא

»[The Uthras left . . . the House of Life . . . the Abode of splendour and Light] . . . they left the Jordan of *Water of Life* and went to the *Water of Chaos* [the *tᵉhōm* of Gen 1^{2}, also = the Lower Water].»

GR $77^{33,36}$ $78^{7,8}$ (*Pet* $79^{4,6,10,11}$) לאמיתימניא השוכא בנהורא
. . . ומיא תאהמיא לאראוזיא . . . באטליא בניא השוכא ומיתקאימיא בניא רורביא

»Darkness is not reckoned with Light . . . and the *Water of Chaos* does not shine . . . the children of Darkness perish but the children of the mighty (Life) shall abide.[1]»

GR 230$^{6-8}$ (*Pet* 228$^{24-26}$) שאתילין לֿמיא תאהמיא וּבראאבותא מישתבין . . . וראהמילה לֿרהגאגתא דתיביל ואמריא מינה לֿאנאפקינין ותיריל לֿאבאטלא

»They drink of the Water of Chaos and are taken captive by pride . . . they love the pleasure of the World (Tibil) and say: 'we will not leave it', and 'the Tibil will not perish'.

MLi 187, *Oxf I* 16,
קאלאיון ד̄מיא הייא   ד̄אפבין למיא תאהמיא
שאפין ונאסבין תוקנא   אשרין וראמין דורדיא

»(It is) the voice of the *Water of Life* that transforms the *Water of Chaos,* it issues and assumes brightness (order?) it pours and throws away the dregs. [Cf. above p. 52 l. 7].

GR 15$^{14, 15}$ (*Pet* 13$^{2, 3}$) 33$^{20, 21}$ (*Pet* 33$^{11, 12}$)

ניתון מיא הייא וניربין במיא תאהמיא בריהה̄ דמיא הייא ׳ניריאז כולא אלמא

»Water of Life may come and mix with Chaotic Water; in the fragrance of the Water of Life the whole world may exult (shine).»

Acc. to *GR 103* the living fire mixes with the chaos-water and earth arises (*Ptahil* functions as demiurg).

GR XI 266$^{33-37}$ (*Pet* 269$^{8-11}$) אמרילה̄ הייא רביא לֿמאנדא ד̄הייא קום אנאת בריש מיא עזיל ונגוד ניגרא ד̄מיא הייא גאטינ(י)א וניזלון וניפלון במיא תאהמיא ומיא ניביסמון נישתון בניא אנאשא וניהון אבואת הייא רביא

»The Great Life said to Manda dHayye; arise, and go to the edge (*lit.* beginning) of the water; draw thither a thin draught of *Water of Life* that it may depart and fall into the *Water of Chaos* and the water (of Chaos) become fragrant (savoury) and the *children of men drink (of it) and become like the Great Life*».

GR XIII 285$^{23, 24, 26-29}$ (*Pet* 288 7, $^{10-12}$)

הייא קאשישיא מן מותא ונהורא קאשישא מן השוכא . . . ונאצארותא קאשישא מן יאהדותא עלאייא קאשישיא מן תיתאייא ויארדנא דמיא הייא קאשישיא מן מיא תאהמיא דאתאר השוך

»Life is older than Death, & Light is older than Darkness . . . and the Nasoræanism is older than Judaism, the (Beings) Above are older than the (Beings) Below, and the *Jordan of Water of Life is older than the Water of Chaos of the Place of Darkness.* Taking to, or loving, the Water of Chaos is equivalent to leaving the Nasoræanism, the Right Faith, and the Life, and Light. Cf. also *GR* xiii 285^{34,35} xv 299^{9,10} 303^{35}.

---

[1] 'Water of Chaos' represents the Lower World, Darkness, the 'Spirit's enslavement under the powers of the Lower World', mortality.

Acc. to *GR* xv 3 307 the *Water of Life* is drawn to the earthly world, and Šilmad and Nidbai are put as its watchers: then the Water mourns because it has been brought to the evil, nether world. The Watchers console it by the information that it *will serve for the baptism of the Mandæans.*

Cf. *GL II* 458^{4,5} (*Pet* 41^{11,12}) מאן רמאן במיא תאהמיא דמינאיהון מיתגיבליא מהאמבליא

»Who threw me in the Water of Chaos from which the destroying ones are formed?» The question is equivalent to the question, »who threw me into the suffering of the world! Who suffered me to be born into this world» (the question is put by the spirit).

We may now turn to the earlier Hermetic writings and begin with *Corp. Herm. I (Poimandres).* The man who speaks (the »I») in Poimandres tells of his vision of the 'beginnings of things'[1] (4, 5 a): ὁρῶ θέαν ἀόριστον, φῶς [δὲ] πάντα γεγενημένα ἥδιόν (Scott: ἤπιόν) τε καὶ ἱλαρόν· καὶ ἠγάσθην (Sc) ἰδών· καὶ μετ᾽ ὀλίγον, σκότος κατωφερὲς ἦν ἐν μέρει τινὶ γεγενημένον, φοβερόν τε καὶ στυγνόν σκολιῶς πεπειραμένον εἶδον μεταβαλλόμενον τὸ σκότος εἰς ὑγράν τινα φύσιν ἀφάτως τεταραγμένην, καὶ καπνὸν ἀποδιδοῦσαν ὡς ἀπὸ πυρός. καί τινα ἦχον ἀποτελοῦσαν ἀνεκλάλητον γοώδη· (εἶτα) βοὴ γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀσύναρθρος ἐξεπέμπετο. (ὡς εἰκάσαι φωνὴν φωτός.) ἐκ δὲ τοῦ φωτὸς προελθὼν λόγος ἅγιος ἐπέβη τῇ [ὑγρᾷ] φύσει, [ὡς εἰκάσαι με φωνὴν εἶναι τοῦ φωτός] — 5 b. Καὶ πῦρ ἄκρατον ἐξεπήδησεν ἐκ τῆς ὑγρᾶς φύσεως ἄνω εἰς ὕψος· κουφὸν δὲ ἦν καὶ ὀξύ, δραστικόν τε. ἅμα καὶ ὁ ἀήρ, ἐλαφρὸς ὤν, ἠκολούθησε τῷ πυρὶ (Reitzenstein; MSS 1 Turnebus: πνεύματι) ἀναβαίνων (τοσοῦτον) μέχρι τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπὸ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος, ὡς δοκεῖν πρέμασθαι αὐτὸν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

Thus in *Corp. Herm.* I 4, 5 the term ὑγρὰ φύσις 'watery substance' is used for the second stage of the ὕλη, the first stage being σκότος κατωφερές 'a downward-tending darkness'. The darkness and the watery substance, 'the chaos', correspond to the σκότος and ἄβυσσος of Gen 1. They also represent the evil principle.[2] The celestial principle is called Light (φῶς), from which proceeds a holy Word (λόγος ἅγιος) which takes its stand upon the watery substance.[1] Then the watery substance, having received the Word, is fashioned into an ordered world (κοσμοποιηθεῖσα; Scott: ἐκοσμοποιήθη).

---

[1] Cf. Walter Scott, *Hermetica* II, pag. 1.

[2] Cf. תהום // evil // darkness, in Rabbinic above p. 54, in Mandaitic above p. 57.

Corp. Herm. I 17: The seven First Men, arising from the First (Divine, Celestial) Man and the φύσις (nature), consist of an immaterial (or perhaps better: celestial) and a material (or better: terrestrial, physical) part. In the formation of the *terrestrial* part three elements are at work, viz. water (ὕδωρ), earth (γῆ) and spirit (Scott: vital spirit, πνεῦμα). The *water* is the *male* and the *earth* the *female:* θηλυκὴ γῆ ἦν καὶ ὕδωρ ὀχευτικόν. The celestial part is made up of Spirit (νοῦς) and Soul (ψυχή), derived from the Light (φῶς) and Life (ζωή) of the First Man. There is no mention, however, of any polarity of male and female between φῶς and ζωή or νοῦς and ψυχή (Scott, *Herm.* ii 49). Neither does ὕδωρ play any part as a term for *Celestial* engendering efflux.

Scott[3] quotes a »close parallel» to *Corp. Herm.* I 17 from Hippolyt's *Refutatio omnium Hæresium* IV 43. »Hippolytus there gives a doctrine which he calls 'Egyptian'; it is rather the doctrine of some Stoicizing Pythagorean, but its author perhaps assumed that Pythagoras had learnt it in Egypt». The doctrine spoken of regards God as an indivisible, self-generating μονάς, who generates (γεννᾷ) the succeding numerical entities δυάς, τριάς etc. Then it proceeds to speak of the cogeneration of such numerical entities, until the process reaches the four elements of πνεῦμα, πῦρ, ὕδωρ and γῆ. Of these four elements it makes the World (κόσμος) and arranges it in a polarity of male and female, dividing it in an *upper hemisphere* consisting of *πνεῦμα and πῦρ*, and a *lower hemisphere*, consisting of *ὕδωρ and γῆ*. The upper hemisphere is characterized as that of the monad, the »beneficent, upward-tending and male hemisphere.» The lower hemisphere is ascribed to the dyad, and called »downward-tending, female and maleficent». Within these two hemispheres, again, there is a polarity πρὸς εὐκαρπίαν καὶ αὔξησιν τῶν ὅλων. Thus in the upper hemisphere τὸ πῦρ is the male and τὸ πνεῦμα the female, in the lower hemisphere τὸ ὕδωρ is the masculine and ἡ γῆ the feminine. That which is born in the upper hemisphere is born ἐκ πυρὸς καὶ πνεύματος, that which is born in the lower hemisphere is born ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ γῆς.

---

[1] Dependent upon the idea of Gen 1^{2}: 'the Spirit of God moving upon the water', combined with the Divine Word of Gen 1$_{3}$ εἶπεν ὁ θεός); vide Scott, *Herm.* ii p. 23.

[2] Cf. *TY Ta'an 64 b, GenR* 13 $_{13, 14}$ above p. 52 l. 7 (bringing in order); *MLi* 187 *GR* 15, 33 above pp. 57.

[3] *Herm.* ii 50.

Another similar representation occurs in Hippol. *Refut. I 2:* Διόδωρος δὲ ὁ Ἐρετριεὺς καὶ Ἀριστόξενος ὁ μουσικός φασι πρὸς Ζαράταν τὸν Χαλδαῖον ἐληλυθέναι Πυθαγόραν· τὸν δὲ ἐκθέσθαι αὐτῷ δύο εἶναι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τοῖς οὖσιν αἴτια, πατέρα καὶ μητέρα· καὶ πατέρα μὲν φῶς, μητέρα δὲ σκότος, τοῦ δὲ φωτὸς μέρη θερμόν, ξηρόν, κοῦφον, ταχύ. τοῦ δὲ σκότους ψυχρόν, ὑγρόν, βαρύ, βραδύ. ἐκ δὲ τούτων πάντα τὸν κόσμον συνεστάναι, ἐκ θηλείας καὶ ἄρρενος. Εἶναι δὲ τὸν κόσμον φύσιν κατὰ μουσικὴν ἁρμονίαν, διὸ καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ποιεῖσθαι τὴν περίοδον ἐναρμόνιον. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐκ γῆς καὶ κόσμου γινομένων τάδε φασὶ λέγειν τὸν Ζαράταν· δύο δαίμονας εἶναι, τὸν μὲν οὐράνιον, τὸν δὲ χθόνιον. καὶ τὸν μὲν χθόνιον ἀνιέναι τὴν γένεσιν ἐκ τῆς γῆς· εἶναι δὲ ὕδωρ· τὸν δὲ οὐράνιον πῦρ μετέχον τοῦ ἀέρος. θερμὸν τοῦ ψυχροῦ. διὸ καὶ τούτων οὐδὲν ἀναιρεῖν οὐδὲ μιαίνειν φησὶ τὴν ψυχήν· ἐστὶ γὰρ ταῦτα οὐσία τῶν πάντων. The narrative makes Pythagoras learn from Zarathuštra[1]: »There are two original causes of things: the Father and the Mother, equivalent to Light and Darkness. And there are two daimones; a celestial one and a terrestrial, the terrestrial daimon bringing forth from the earth, being himself water; the celestial again being fire.» The *Corp. Herm. I* and the parallel representations attested in Hippol. thus, *while containing the doctrine of two worlds* and, in some sense, of *two births, or natures of generation, present the very contrast to Jn 35 with regard to the symbolical use of the term ὕδωϱ.*

The so-called *Mithras-Liturgy* (ed. Dieterich-Weinreich 3, pp. 3 ff.), in an introductory prayer preserves the following characteristic expressions: Γένεσις πρώτη τῆς ἐμῆς γενέσεως, . . . ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐμῆς ἀρχῆς πρώτη . . . πνεῦμα πνεύματος τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ πνεύματος πρῶτον . . . πῦρ τὸ εἰς ἐμὴν κρᾶσιν τῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ *κϱάσεων θεοδώϱητον* τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ *πυϱὸς πϱῶτον . . . ὕδωϱ ὕδατος τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ ὕδατος πϱῶτον* . . . οὐσία γεώδης τῆς ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐσίας γεώδους πρώτη . . . σῶμα τέλειον ἐμοῦ . . . διαπεπλασμένον . . . ἐν ἀφωτίστῳ καὶ διαυγεῖ κόσμῳ ἔν τε ἀψύχῳ καὶ ἐψυχωμένῳ . . . ἐὰν δὴ ὑμῖν δόξῃ . . . μεταπαραδῶναί με τῇ ἀθανάτῳ γενέσει . . . ἵνα . . . ἐποπτεύσω τὴν ἀθάνατον ἀρχὴν τῷ *ἀθανάτῳ πνεύματι . . . τῷ ἀθανάτῳ ὕδατι . . . τῷ στεϱεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀέϱι . . . ἵνα*

---

[1] »The representation of Pythagoras as learning from Zarathuštra indicates that the doctrine in question is a combination of Persian and Pythagoræan elements.» Vide Bousset, *HG* p. 153 The Persian elements: Light—Darkness, the Pythagoræan Male—Female.

νοήματι μεταγεννηθῶ . . . ἵνα ἐνάρχωμαι *καὶ πνεύσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸ ἱερὸν πνεῦμα* . . . ἵνα θαυμάσω τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ . . . ἵνα θεάσωμαι *τὸ ἄβυσσον τῆς ἀνατολῆς φρικτὸν ὕδωρ* . . . *καὶ* ἀκούσῃ μου ὁ *ζῳογ΄νος καὶ* περικεχυμένος *αἰ*θήρ. This moves in the elemental conceptions; fire is evidently the Divine element in man; but there is also an immortal (or celestial) ὕδωρ contrasted with the terrestrial ὕδωρ.

Clem. again represent the fire as the evil principle. The fire as evil principle is connected with the fire of the sacrifices; as its contrast stands the water as the sacred element connected with the water of baptism (*Rec.* 1_{48}). The water is the *Divine World-Creating Principle* acc. to *Hom.* 11_{24} (cf. *Rec.* 6_{7-8}) λογισάμενος *ὅτι τὰ πάντα τὸ ὕδωρ ποιεῖ,* τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ὑπὸ πνεύματος κινήσεως τὴν γένεσιν λαμβάνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν ὅλων θεοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχει.[1]

Acc. to Bousset the conceptions of *Clem.* are closely connected with the Elxaitic ideas and both point towards a connexion with religious groups living in the environments of the Jordan and also in Mesopotamia in the first century A.D. and probably earlier. With those religious group baptismal cults or ideas played an important rôle.[2]

A similar contraposition of water and fire is found in Epiphan. *Hær.* 19_3 »τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ εἶναι δεξιόν, πῦρ δὲ ἀλλότριον εἶναι φάσκων διὰ τούτων τῶν λέξεων· τέκνα, μὴ πρὸς τὸ εἶδος τοῦ πυρὸς πορεύεσθε, ὅτι πλανᾶσθε· πλάνη γάρ ἐστι τὸ τοιοῦτον . . . πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ ὕδατος». *Hær* 53^1 »τετίμηται δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τοῦτο ὡς θεὸν ἡγοῦνται σχεδὸν φάσκοντες εἶναι τὴν ζωὴν ἐκ τούτου». Here then Water is the male element, Fire the female. Life originates from the Water.

Act. Thom. 52: (The apostle speaks over a basin of water to consecrate it for healing): »Come ye *waters from the living waters,* that were sent unto us, *the true from the true;* the rest that was sent to us from the rest, *the power of salvation* that cometh from that power which conquereth all things and subdueth them unto his own will: *come and dwell in these waters, that the gift of the Holy Ghost may be perfectly consummated in them*».[1] Here the idea of the living waters emanating from the celestial Realm, or from the Abode of Divine truth is clearly present. The similarity with the idea, attested in Rabbinic dicta quoted above, of a mystical connexion between this Divine efflux and the earthly water — so that the initiated can see and use the earthly water as a vehicle for the power inherent in the celestial water — is apparent. The healing power of this Divine efflux is merely an attenuation of its life-giving or generating power.

---

[1] Bousset, *HG* pp. 151, 152.

[2] *NG* pp. 134—159 Bousset lays stress on the influence of Persian ideas upon the groups in question. Acc. to Bousset, they emphasized the celestial character of the water as against the lower evil nature of fire in conscious contrast to the Persian conception, which was of course, reverse. Typical of the ideas here in question is, acc. to Bousset, that of the Time *(zrwana akarana)* as Creator, as itself from the beginning, without origin or end, in the course of creation water and fire being brought forth, from the union of which Ormuzd arose. (Bousset, *HG* pp. 139, 140 quoting *Ulemaï Islam,* ed. Vullers pp. 44 ff.) The Persian heretic Mazdak speaks of three elements, water, fire and earth, from the mixing of which the Governor or the Good and the Governor of the Evil arose. Cf. the frequent conception in Rabbinic of creation from 'fire and water'.

Lastly an important section from Hippolyt's description of the doctrines of the Naassenes may be quoted: *Ref. V 8* pp. 110 f. (Naassenes) *῞Υδατα* (of Ps 29[3]) φησίν ἐστὶ πολλὰ ἡ *πολυσχιδὴς τῶν θνητῶν γένεσις* ἀνθρώπων, ἀφ᾽ ἧς βοᾷ καὶ κέκραγε πρὸς τὸν ἀχαρακτήριστον ἄνθρωπον . . . Ποταμούς (of Isa 43[2]), φησί, λέγει τὴν ὑγρὰν τῆς γενέσεως οὐσίαν, πῦρ δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν γένεσιν ὁρμὴν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν . . . Περὶ δὲ τῆς *ἀνόδου* αὐτοῦ, τουτέστι τῆς *ἀναγεννήσεως*, ἵνα γένηται *πνευματικός*, οὐ σαρκικός, λέγει, φησίν, ἡ γραφή· (Ps 24[7,9]) ῎Αρατε πύλας . . . καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, τουτέστι, θαῦμα θαυμάτων . . . Ταύτην, φησί, τὴν εἴσοδον καὶ ταύτην τὴν πύλην εἶδεν εἰς Μεσοποταμίαν πορευόμενος ὁ Ιακώβ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς ἔφηβος ἤδη γινόμενος καὶ ἀνήρ, τουτέστιν ἐγνωρίσθη τῷ εἰς Μεσοποταμίαν πορευομένῳ. Μεσοποταμία δέ, φησίν, ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ μεγάλου ὠκεανοῦ *ῥοή, ἀπὸ τῶν μέσων ῥέουσα τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου*, καὶ ἐθαύμασε τὴν οὐράνιον πύλην εἰπών (Gen 28[17]): ὡσ φοβερὸς ὁ τόπος οὗτος . . . καὶ αὕτη ἡ πύλη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Διὰ τοῦτο, φησί, λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ πύλη ἡ ἀληθινή (Jn 10[9], cf. Clem. *Homil.* 3[52]) ῎Εστι δὲ ὁ ταῦτα λέγων ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀχαρακτηρίστου, φησίν, ἄνωθεν κεχαρακτηρισμένος τέλειος ἄνθρωπος. Οὐ δύναται οὖν, φησί, σωθῆναι *ὁ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῇ διὰ ταύτης εἰσελθὼν τῆς πύλης*.

Important is here the connexion of *regeneration, accent into heaven, water of generation* from the τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, and *spiritual birth*. This will again be touched upon in dealing with Jn 4.

From the different representations set forth above, it is evident, that the birth from 'water and πνεῦμα' occurs in a twofold connexion, viz. (1) in cosmological speculations, where both water and πνεῦμα play different and variant rôles, as elements or as creative principles both for the 'lower' and the 'higher' creation; Pythagoræan, Stoic, Babylonian and Persian ideas all meet in assigning a cosmological function to the 'water'; essentially to the same sphere of notions belongs the idea of man as composed of the four elements; (2) in what may be termed 'mystical' connotations, frequently intermingled with cosmological language, yet clearly representing quite a different range of ideas, where *'water' stands for a certain efflux from the Celestial or Inner or Spiritual Origin of Life,* by which efflux that Origin of Life *creates or generates or gives Life;* in particular, this efflux is viewed in the aspect of the *generation of Life in the lower world;* or the *'sending down' the seed of life into the terrestrial beings. In this senses the 'water'* (or 'rain', 'dew', 'drop') *may be used as equivalent of 'seed',* σπέρμα.

---

[1] R. Harris, *ApNT* p. 389.

The context of Jn 3 5, as was shown above, makes it clear, that the γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος is identical with γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν, 'from above'. It may safely be argued, then, that ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος *primarily* means ἐκ σπέρματος πνευματικῆς, from a spiritual seed, in contrast to earthly, or sarcical seed. Taken in this sense the expression receives a striking comment in 1 Jn 3 9: Πᾶς ὁ *γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ* ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι *σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει·* καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται,* compared also with 1 Petr 1 23 ἀναγεγεννημένοι *οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου.*

The tedious investigation in the preceding setting forth various parallels of the use of the term water in connexion with ideas of creation, birth, regeneration etc., may be urged to have served to bring into clearer light *the precise sphere* of thoughts, or let us rather say, *mystical representations* that *the Jn-ine teaching makes its basis* or point of departure. Thus, negatively, it may be stated, that the passage takes no account of the various themes of creation — whether in physical-sarcical or in the celestial-spiritual world — through or from certain *elements:* it does not view the nature of the spiritual man from the aspect of a κρᾶσις[1] where πνεῦμα and ὕδωρ would be the component parts. Positively, again, it may be said, that *the passage links up with a range of conceptions according to which 'water' is used as a term for celestial* σπέρμα, viewed — *and this is constitutive* — as an *efflux* from above, from God. To repeat: the expression wants to convey, that *the spiritual man*, or, which is the same, *the member* or citizen *of the* βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ *owes his existence* as such *to the procreative power of the efflux from God*, *the* σπέρμα *in the spirit*.

---

[1] Cf. The Inceptive Prayer of the so-called Mithras-Liturgy cited above and Dieterich-Weinreich, *Eine Mithras-Liturgie*^{3}, p. 58, note 2).

The preceding investigation has, however, also shown, that this very idea of a Divine efflux under the term of 'water' was, in some circles, intimately connected with the baptismal cult. This is pronouncedly the case in *Mandaitic*. In the *Mysteries*, as is well known, there are instances of the connexion of the ideas of regeneration, Divine birth etc. with baptismal initiation ceremonies[1], although there the idea of 'water' as a Divine efflux is not attested. Of the *Gnostic* Menander and his circle Irenæus tells: Resurrectionem enim per id, quod est in eum baptisma, accipere eius discipulos, et ultra non posse mori sed perseverare non senescentes et immortales.[2] Here, also, the constitutive idea of the Divine efflux seems to be wanting.

Touching the Jn-ine position, the mention of the baptism of Jesus in the section immediately following, viz. $3^{22}-4^{2}$ and the contraposition in 1^{33} of the baptism of John ἐν ὕδατι and the baptism of Jesus ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ are suggestive.

This makes it necessary to put the question: is there, after all, in Jn 3^5, a conscious allusion to baptism, and in that case, to the essentiality of baptism, as a rite or sacrament, for or in connexion with the generation, the birth from above into the Kingdom of God.

The predominant view among the scholars of later time seems to be, that this question must be answered in the affirmative. It may be that this view largely rests upon the assumption, that 'water' here cannot possibly mean anything but water of baptism.[3]

---

[1] Tertullian, *De Baptism.* 5; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* V 4 11; Firmicus Maternus, *De Errore Profan. Relig.* 2 (on the 'Egyptian' cult of the water). Vide SAngus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity* pp. 81—83.

[2] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* I 23, 5. Cf. H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis* p. 104.

[3] Some characteristic comments in this vein may be quoted:

J. Grill, in his important *Untersuchungen* etc. 1902 i 43 says: »Sie (the new birth) kommt nur zu stand ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, mit anderen Worten durch den an das Sakraments-mysterium der christlichen Taufe gebundenen Empfang eines gedoppelten Heilsguts: der Vergebung der Sünden und des heiligen Geistes».

Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* p. 190: »... die Leser des 4. Ev. mussten durch 3^5 an 1^{38} zurückerinnert werden. Sie sollten es nicht anders

To answer the question in the affirmative presents great difficulties. The introduction of baptism as an essential element at this point of the discourse (3^5) breaks the whole continuity of the argument, which is concerned, not with contrasting the baptism

---

verstehen, als dass jedermann der Wassertaufe des Jo, der Taufe der Sinnesänderung und Sündenvergebung sich unterziehen und die Geistestaufe d. h. die uneigentlicher Weise als Taufe bezeichnete Mitteilung eines neuen heiligen Geistes seitens des kommenden Messias erleben müsse, um als ein neugeborener Mensch in Gottes Reich einzugehen».

C. Clemen, *Enst. Joh. Ev.* 1912, p. 93: »wenngleich durch die Taufe bewirkt, bleibt die Wiedergeburt doch unbegreiflich, und wenn das Wasser nachher nicht mehr erwähnt wird, so folgt daraus ... nur, *dass es auf diese Vermittlung des Geistes oder der Wiedergeburt nicht ankommt*». Clemen evidently recognises, that the idea of baptism cannot be an essential element in the idea of new birth in Jn 3^5, and is lead to think it alluded to only through his assumption that the 'water' can only refer to baptism.

H. Weinel, *Bibl. Theol. d. N. T.*^{2}, 1913, p. 592: »Um zu sagen, was ihm die *Taufe* ist, lässt er Jesus dem Nikodemus gegenüber den Spruch von der Wiedergeburt vertiefen zu der Forderung einer Geburt von oben 3^3 und erläutert das durch die Worte 'Geburt aus Wasser und Geist', den Weg anzeigend, wie solche übernatürliche Geburt stattfinden kann ... das ganze Stück (lässt) in seiner tiefsinnigen und innigen Weise besser das Höchste ahnen ... als irgend ein anderes Wort über die Taufe im Neuen Testament».

P. Gardner, *Eph. Gosp.* 1916, p. 200: »So the Evangelist contrasts their (referring to the disciples of John the Baptist) baptism which was merely an external rite, with the Christian baptism, which accompanied an illumination of the whole being by means of the Spirit».

W. Bauer, *JEv*^{2} 1925, pp. 50 f.: »Damit soll nicht die Geistestaufe des Messias neben die Wassertaufe des Johannes gestellt werden und beide als unbedingt nötig zum Heil erscheinen (cf. Zahn above): vielmehr tritt der Nur-Wasser-Taufe des Vorläufers eine andere gegenüber, die christliche, bei der sich Wasser und Geist ... zu gemeinsamer Wirkung verbinden ... Hier wie bei den Mysterienkulten vollzieht sich im Ritus die göttliche Zeugung ... so kann ... neben 1^{26} u. $3^{22\text{ff.}}$ die Absicht wohl keine andere sein als die, den christlichen Brauch über alle sonstigen Taufzeremonien zu erhöhen, da ihm allein wirklicher Wert innewohne». This argument could more easily be followed if it were formulated to the effect, that an interpolator, through the insertion of ὕδατος καὶ, had intended to give the Jn-ine passage such a meaning. To read a reference to the *rite* as an essential element of the new birth, or even, as that in which the birth is brought about, into the Jn-ine context, so that the baptism were the real *point of the argument,* is impossible without begging the question. — The usual reference to *Titus* 3^5 e. a. is irrevelant, since the question clearly is not whether there was any connexion between baptism and new birth — that connexion needs no demonstration, — but whether the 'water' in Jn 3^5 refers to baptism.

E. Carpenter, *JWr* 1927, p. 417: »According to the current text (of 3^5, assuming that ὕδατος καὶ is original) the Evangelist recognized the partnership of both water and Spirit in bringing it (*scil.* the regeneration or rebirth) about».

of John with the baptism of Jesus, but with contrasting the birth from above as a condition for entering the Kingdom 'Above' (cf. vs. 13) as a *real* birth, with the birth from below (as a condition for entering the world below). The fact, that baptism is never mentioned or alluded to in the rest of the section, is also decisive, since it is characteristic for the Jn-ine discourses to be all through dominated by essential elements once introduced. The difficulties of assuming the authenticity of a primary and original reference to baptism here have lead various scholars to regard the words ὕδατος καὶ as additional[1], whereas others in examining the Gospel have reached the conclusion that Jn does not refer to the sacraments at all[2] or rejects their necessity for the true believers.[3]

R. H. Strachan, who shows a remarkable faculty of intuitive penetration (»Einfühlung») into the mind of the Evangelist, although accepting the allusion to baptism assumes that the 'water' may also be some procreative symbol.[4]

---

[1] Dieffenbach, Pierson-Naber, Wendt, van Manen, Kirsopp Lake, von Dobschütz, Wellhausen, Andresen, Völter, Merx; vide Clemen, *Enst. Joh. Ev.* p. 92, Spitta, *JEv* p. xiv marks the words ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος as 'the Redactor's own reflexions'.

[2] B. Weiss, *Der Johanneische Lehrbegriff* p. 290 f. Also B. Weiss, *Joh Ev*^{9} 1902 (in Meyer's *Komm.*) p. 110: »V. 5 erklärt sich Jesus über das ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι näher indem er mit dem ἐκ (vgl. 1^{13}) auf den ursächlichen Ausgangspunkt solchen Geborenwerdens in ὕδωρ καὶ πνεῦμα hinweist. Die Artikellosigkeit der beiden Worte zeigt, dass *Wasser und Geist hier ihrem Wesen nach* gedacht sind ... und schliesst somit jede direkte Beziehung auf die Johannestaufe ... oder gar auf die christliche Taufe ... aus. *Das Wasser* ist als *reinigender Faktor* gedacht, der die Sünde ... hinwegnimmt; *der Geist* als *wirkungskräftiges Prinzip eines neuen Lebens,* und der Gedanke ist, dass ohne Abthun des alten sündigen Wesens und ohne Erzeugung eines ganz neuen die V. 3 gemeinte Geburt nicht zu stande kommt.» Here the essential parity of water and spirit as terms for celestial principles or forces is rightly recognized. The interpretation of water as 'purifying factor' can, however, scarcely be upheld. There is no trace of the idea of purification as in any way dominating the section 3^{1-21}.

[3] A. Thoma in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* 1876, p. 371.

[4] R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel*^{2}, pp. 93 f.: »*Born of water and of the Spirit.* A difficult verse. What does he mean by 'water'? It is quite possible that in accordance with his style elsewhere the Evangelist gives a double meaning to the words.

1. He refers to Christian Baptism. Just as in the case of the Eucharist (chap. vi) the Evangelist has in view, in his interpretation of the conversation, a superstitious view of the sacrament of baptism. This he corrects by conjoining 'water' and 'spirit'. Submission to the rite of baptism by itself cannot effect the new birth. There must be present not only the life-giving principle of the Spirit, but conscious experience of it on the part of the believer ... The

It may be concluded: the expression ἐξ ὕδατος in 3^5 contains no essential allusion to baptism. Nevertheless it shall be maintained that the sense of the term 'water' is not restricted to that of (spiritual) 'semen', but there are certainly, after Jn-ine fashion, allusions to other ideas, and, may it be said, a whole world of ideas. The ideas alluded to, moreover, are such as dominate the present and subsequent discourses in Jn. These ideas may be summed up, to begin with, in the nexus: Water as Divine Efflux — Celestial Waters — waters from above — Life-giving, Living Water — the Divine Gift coming down from on high — waters of Eternal Life — Waters of Eternal Truth.

It has already been shown that the parallel conception of the celestial generating principle under the term 'water' in Rabbinic and other related representations adduced above is constitutively linked up with the idea of the Divine Efflux. The mystic (*TB Hag* 14 b) *ascends* and beholds the Celestial Waters. From Celestial Waters (מים עליונים) the Divine gifts come down, are 'sent down', to men as a blessing (ברכה), in which aspect they in the peculiar Rabbinic mode are often termed מטר or גשם. The Celestial or Divine Water coming down possesses, in particular, the

---

believer must first have 'seen the kingdom of God' in the person of Jesus. Thus the sacrament of baptism is psychologically conditioned, and is raised above the level of a magical, or quasi-physical communication of divine grace.

2. Water may also symbolise the fact of physical birth ... As in viii 31 ff. Jesus is combating the idea that the child of Abraham is *ipso facto* the child of God. It will be noted that this interpretation suits very well the curiously allusive character of the Evangelist's thinking. The general thought of the passages alternates between the ideas of physical and spiritual birth.» It may be remarked here that a possible allusion to baptism in 3^5 would not be very well suited to make the readers addressed understand the sacrament as 'psychologically conditioned' and to raise it, in their conception 'above the level of a magical, or quasi-physical communication of divine grace'. It may have that effect on a modern reader, who understands the word 'spiritual' to mean something beyond time and place, or ethical, rational or psychological, as the case may be. The 'spirit' both as Jn understands it and, evidently, presumes his readers to take it, has quite different associations. Thus it would not be so very far removed from the general keeping of the context of Jn 3^{1-21} if a reader, interpreting the ἐξ ὕδατος as referring to the baptism, would see vindicated there a conception of the baptism as involving a birth within man of a pneumatical body, that is to say, taking the sacrament in a magical and quasi-physical sense. — Strachan sees the idea of water as the 'creative element in the womb' attested in 4 Ez 8^8. The conception occurring there is, however, not very closely related the Jn-ine conception; cf. Box's note *ad loc* in *Ezra-Apocalypse*.

power of Giving Life, the coming down of the מטר is necessary for the תחיית המתים, (cf. above p. 55).

In this complex of ideas the dominating notions of the present, preceding and following contexts are recognizable: the ἄνωθεν, 'from above': $3^{3,7,31}$, ἀπὸ θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ: $3^{2,13,27,31}$, the divine gift: $3^{16,27,34,35}$, the Eternal Life: $3^{15,16,35}$. In the preceding the connexion is especially with the ideas of ἀνάβασις and κατάβασις of 1^{51}, and in the following, again, very markedly with the discourse on the Living Water, the Divine Gift, $4^{7\text{ff.}}$ The import of this complex of ideas will be further dwelt upon below on $4^{7\text{ff.}}$

Before finishing the present excurse some further questions must be dealt with. The first question concerns the nature of the spiritual birth spoken of in the section. From the interpretation arrived at in the preceding, according to which the birth from above is a *real* birth, contrasted with, but also, in a definite sense, analogous with, the physical birth, it follows, that the birth from above is not adequately defined as a moral change in man. The antithesis of sarcical and spiritual birth put side by side with the antithesis of terrestrial and celestial world makes it clear, that the meaning is: just as one must be born as a physical organism in order to enter the physical world, so one must be born as a spiritual organism in order to enter the celestial or Divine world. To quote E. F. Scott[1]: »Thus it follows ... that John involves himself in a view which may fairly be described as semi-physical. The true life is regarded as a kind of higher essence inherent in the divine nature, analogous to the life-principle in man, but different in quality, — spiritual instead of earthly. Ethical conseptions fall into a secondary place. Man requires to undergo a radical change not in heart merely, but in the very constitution of his nature. Until he possesses himself of the higher, diviner essence there can be no thought of his participating in the life of God.» It may be remarked, however, that such terms as 'semi-physical' are not quite appropriate. It may not be out of the way to draw into comparison current mystical notions of the time with regard to spiritual existence. Thus Jewish mystical notions, both in Rabbinic and extraneous circles, pictured spiritual or celestial beings as having form and appearance, and also possessing a body. Nevertheless one was quite definite about the fact, that the celestial body was not terrestrial, *i. e.* physical or material. It was constituted by a celestial substance, usually expressed by some such terms as 'fire', 'light', 'splendour' or 'glory' in the use of which there was a conscious contrast to the terrestrial substance of 'flesh and blood' (בשר ודם). In order to enter the highest heaven, the Celestial Realm, the ascending human being must change into fire, take on a body of light, or, as it is also expressed, put on 'garments of light'. When Enoch was made into the Celestial Being, called Metatròn, he was changed »from flesh into fire».[1] The best illustration to this sphere of ideas may be brought from 1 Cor 15$^{40\text{ff.}}$: καὶ σώματα ἐπουράνια, καὶ σώματα ἐπίγεια . . . εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν . . . καὶ καθὼς ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, φορέσωμεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου. Τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύναται, οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ. Cf. 2 Cor 5$^{1-4}$. There is also in mystic notions from different times and places of origin a common idea of an inner, spiritual 'body' sometimes viewed as merely latent in earthly men and brought into life only in the hereafter, sometimes as the conscious possession even during earthly life of the twice-born, who as a consequence, are able to perceive and act both in the earthly world and the spiritual world.[2]

---

[1] *Fourth Gospel* p. 258. Cf. pp. 288 ff.

That the birth into a spiritual organism is also a birth into a new life of moral values needs scarcely be said. The new realm entered is the realm of truth in contrast to falsehood, of light in contrast to darkness; the ethical aspect of the new life is clearly enunciated in the section in vss. 20, 21: πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐληγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἐστιν εἰργασμένα.

Another question that ought to be put is, whether the birth from above, acc. to Jn, takes place during the earthly life or in the hereafter. The answer to that question would seem to be self-evident: the new birth is something that comes during earthly life. No doubt Nicodemus is represented as understanding it in this sense, and the answers he receives do not seem to refute the notion. The interpretation of 3^{5} as referring to baptism necessarily implies the same. There is no doubt that Titus 3^{6} in speaking of the παλινγενεσία and ἀνακαίνωσις πνεύματος ἁγίου refers to the present life of the baptised, and similarly St. Paul in Rom 6^{2-14} enjoins a 'walking in newness of life' and admonishes the baptised, vs. 11: οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The reference of $3^{20,\,21}$ to the new life spoken of in the section would also seem to imply that the birth from above is to take place in man during his earthly life. The notion would seem to be genuinely Jn-ine that, just as the unbeliever is 'judged already' (3^{18}) so the believer is born into eternal life already in this life.

---

[1] *Vide 3 En* 15.

[2] Not to be confused with the ψυχὴ-εἴδωλον, דוגמא, *linga (sukṣma)-śarira* and similar conceptions of an inner body. It corresponds approximately to the Hindu *manasa-rupa* and the *ṣurap nᵉšāmā* of the Zohar.

There are, however, in the Gospel, some pervading features which do not allow the decision of the question quite so affirmatively. These will be dealt with in discussing the import of $6^{39\,\text{ff.}}$ In the present connexion it may suffice preliminarily to suggest, that there is in the Jn-ine conception of the birth from above beside the selfevident connotation what may be termed an eschatological significance. Further, it must be allowed, that there is possibly an intentional duplicity of meaning in the expressions 'ἰδεῖν' or 'εἰσελθεῖν εἴς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ'. A similar duplicity of sense adheres, it may be suggested, to the term ζωὴ αἰώνιος. The duplicity may be defined thus: there are two stages of entrance into the Kingdom of God, or of having eternal life. The first stage is that attained during the earthly life, the second that attained in the hereafter. It will be seen, once the attention has been fixed on this point, that this duplicity[1] is one of the central features of the Gospel. It applies also to the conceptions of δόξα or δοξασθῆναι, both of J himself and of the believers (*vide* below on 13^{31}).

What constitutes the attainment of the first stage of new life is clearly stated in the section: it is the πίστις, repeatedly referred to. But in that very word there is included the idea of aspiration, of looking forward to, the second stage, or the full reality: $3^{12,\,15,\,16,\,18}$; similarly there is in the perception of the 'open heaven' 1^{51} and the partaking in the communion with the Celestial World under the term of ἀνάβασις a dwelling on the first stage, the experience in this life, as against the ἀνάβασις of 3^{13} referring to the other-world experience. There is thus an allusion to the birth from above in the ἀνάστασις ζωῆς 5^{29}, and the *connexion* between the new life begun here on earth through the belief on the »son of man lifted up» 3 14 and the birth from above into the Kingdom of God in the second sense is expressed in the words μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν 5 24.

---

[1] The duplicity here maintained does not *a priori* imply the duplicity of elements of thought, »two lines of thinking», emphasized by Scott, *Fourth Gospel*, e. g. p. 367.

The sense of the birth from above as a condition for entrance into and perception of the Kingdom of God is further illustrated by vs. 11: ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν. Here speaks the one, who is present in the Celestial World, who sees the Kingdom of God and knows its Realities, τὰ ἐπουράνια. The Spiritual Being, in all senses born from above, but born also into the earthly life (σὰρξ ἐγένετο), speaks to those, represented by Nicodemus, who are born only ἐκ τῆς σαρκός. The sentence intends to picture the reality of the Life in the Spiritual World, again in contrast and analogy with the terrestrial.

In vss. 1—12 there seems to be no definite reference to the essentiality of the Son of Man for the bringing about of what is termed the birth from above. This essentiality is, however, being introduced with vs. 12, there, to begin with, under the aspect of J as being the one who can bear testimony of the Celestial World, the entrance into which is conditioned by the birth from above. Clearly, however, the essential character of the Son of Man also in this connexion is brought forth from vs. 13 onwards. With vs. 13 the teaching is conveyed, that the birth from above in reality is necessarily bound of with the Son of Man.

3 13 ***καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ].*** This verse evidently is intended to refer to the preceding, and its sense, with reference taken to the foregoing context, is quite clear: no one has ascended into heaven, entered the Kingdom of God in heaven, except he who has come down from heaven, the Son of Man. That is: — in view of the inclusive connotation of the term Son of Man — the only possibility of being born from above, to ascend into or enter the Kingdom of God, is given in the Son of Man. The actual meaning of the ἀνάβασις and κατάβασις of the Son of Man, however, needs further investigation.

The wording οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν etc. immediately suggests, that there is a refutation here of some current notions of ascent into heaven. Such notions were, as is well known, frequent. Any longer exposition of the Jewish and Christian (-Gnostic) representation of the ascent into heaven will be unnecessary since such an exposition is given by Bousset.[1] Some characteristic quotations of relevant passages may however be apposite.

1 En 70 2: »And it came to pass after this, that his (Enoch's) name was raised aloft to that Son of Man and to the Lord of Spirits from amongst those who dwell on the earth ... 71 1 and it came to pass after this, that my spirit was translated and it ascended into the heavens, and I saw the holy sons of God.»[2] *2 En* 1—21 tell of Enoch's ascension into heaven, how he beholds the celestial things and receives revelations, 22 ff. relate how Enoch is transformed into a Celestial Being.[3] Acc. to *Test Levi* 2 5 ff. the Patriarch Levi ascends to heaven while in sleep Similarly Baruch in *2 Bar*[4] and Isaiah in *Asc. Isa.*[4] The ascension of St. Paul acc. to 2 Cor 12 2,4 (»whether in the body or out of the body», he could not tell) is well known. *3 En* 3—16, 48 C speak of Enoch's translation into heaven and transformation into Metatron the Unique Celestial Being. *3 En* 1, 2. 42 - 48 A, narrate R. Ishmaᶜel's ascension into the highest heaven and his visions there in a manner suggesting that such an ascension was the regular aspiration of the mystic of the circle. *Tos* and *TB Ḥag*

---

[1] *Die Himmelsreise der Seele* pp. 136 ff. Cf. Buonaiuti, *Gnostic Fragments* pp. 43 ff.

[2] Charles's text i *A & P.*

[3] Charles, *2 En.*

[4] *A & P.* Cf. *Apocalypse of Abraham* (ed. G. H. Box) chh. 15—31.

14 b preserve the well-known tradition of the four 'who entered Paradise' (R. ʿAqiḃā, R. 'Elišaʿ ben Abuya, Ben ʿAzzai and Ben Zōmā) or, which is really the same, 'ascended on high'. The mystical experiences in question, hence also the aspirations to ascend on high [עלות למרום], were prominent with *R. Yōḥ*^{a}*nān ben Zakkai* (about 40–80 A.D.) and his school. A regular requisite for the ascension is an angelic guide or χειραγωγός.[1] The stress seems in these earlier sources always to be on the *ascent* into heaven and the obtaining thereby of Divine revelations and experiences of the Celestial Realities. The mystical signification of the κατάβασις in connexion with pre-existence is scarcely traceable. Similarly in the Hermetic literature, the earliest part (I) is merely concerned with the ἀνάβασις:

Corp Herm. I 1 'Εννοίας μοί ποτε γενομένης περὶ τῶν ὄντων, καὶ μετεωρισθείσης (μοι) [μεν] τῆς διανοίας σφόδρα, [ὕπνῳ] δὲ κατασχεθεισῶν μου τῶν σωματικῶν αἰσθήσεων, οὐ μέντοι καθάπερ [τ]οῖ[ς] (ὕπνῳ) βεβαρημένοι[ς] ἐκ κόρου τροφῆς ἢ ἐκ κόπου σώματος, ἔδοξα . . .

»Once on a time when I had begun to think about the things that are, and *my thought had soared high aloft,* while my bodily senses had been put under restraint [by *sleep*] — yet not such sleep as that of men weighed down by fullness of food or by bodily weariness.» (Scott.) The general frame of the first libellus resembles that of the Jewish writings quoted. The seer is taken up into celestial regions and there beholds the beginnings of things and receives revelation. — Quite different connotations of the descent and ascent are presented by libellus IV, which for its bearing upon the present Jn-ine passage and its typical salvation-doctrine may be quoted more fully:

Corp. Herm. IV 2 [ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸν πάντα κόσμον ἐποίησεν ὁ δημιουργός] ἠθέλησε καὶ τὴν γῆν κοσμῆσαι· κόσμον δὲ θείου σώματος κατέπεμψε τὸν ἄνθρωπον [εἰκόνα] ζῴου ἀθανάτου ζῷον θνητόν. »And when the Creator had made the ordered universe, he willed to set in order the earth also, and so he *sent down* man, a mortal creature made in the image of an immortal being, to be an embellishment of the divine body (Scott: = the earth)».

Corp. Herm. IV 3, 6 τὸν μὲν οὖν λόγον, ὦ Τάτ, (ἐν) πᾶσι τοῖς ανθρώποις ἐμέρισε, τὸν δὲ νοῦν οὐκέτι, οὐ φθονῶν τισιν· ὁ γὰρ φθόνος οὐκ οὐρανόθεν ἄρχεται, κάτω δὲ συνίσταται ταῖς τῶν νοῦν μὴ ἐχόντων ἀνθρώπων ψυχαῖς . . . Κρατῆρα μέγαν πληρώσας τούτου κατέπεμψε, δοὺς κήρυκα, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν αὐτῷ κηρύξαι ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καρδίαις τάδε· Βάπτισον σεαυτὴν ἡ δυναμένη εἰς τοῦτον τὸν κρατῆρα [γνωρίζουσα ἐπὶ τί γέγονας, καὶ] ἡ πιστεύουσα ὅτι ἀνελεύσῃ πρὸς τὸν καταπέμψαντα τὸν κρατῆρα (ἡ γνωρίζουσα ἐπὶ τί γέγονας). ὅσοι μὲν οὖν συνῆκαν τοῦ κηρύγματος, καὶ ἐβαπτίσαντο τοῦ νοός, οὗτοι μετέσχον τῆς γνώσεως, καὶ τέλειοι ἐγένοντο ἄνθρωποι, τὸν νοῦν δεξάμενοι. ὅσοι δὲ ἥμαρτον τοῦ κηρύγματος, οὗτοι [οἱ τὸν] μὲν λόγ(ικ)ον [ἔχοντες], τὸν [δὲ] νοῦν μὴ προσειληφότες, [καὶ οὗτοι μέν], ἀγνοοῦντες ἐπὶ τί γεγόνασι καὶ ὑπὸ τίνος (αἱ δὲ αἰσθήσεις τούτων ταῖς τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων παραπλήσιαι καὶ ἐν θυμῷ καὶ ἐν) ὀργῇ (τὴν) [καὶ ἀ]κρασίᾳ [συν]έχονται, (οὐ) θαυμάζοντες [τὰ] οὐ (τὰ) θέας ἄξια, ταῖς (δὲ) τῶν σωμάτων ἡδοναῖς καὶ ὀρέξεσι προσέχοντες, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα τὸν ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι πιστεύοντες. ὅσοι δὲ τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δωρεᾶς μετέσχον, οὗτοι, ὦ Τάτ, κατὰ σύγκρισιν τῶν ἑτέρων ἀθάνατοι ἀντὶ θνητῶν εἰσί. πάντα [γὰρ] ἐμπεριλαβόντες τῷ ἑαυτῶν νοΐ, τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς, τὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ εἴ τί ἐστιν ὑπὲρ οὐρανόν, τοσοῦτον ἑαυτοὺς ὑψώσαντες εἶδον τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ιδόντες, συμφορὰν ἡγήσαντο τὴν ἐνθάδε διατριβήν, [καὶ] καταφρονήσαντες πάντων τῶν σωματικῶν (καὶ ἀσωμάτων) ἐπὶ τὸ ἓν καὶ μόνον [ἀγαθὸν] σπεύδουσιν. αὕτη, ὦ Τάτ, ἡ τοῦ νοῦ ἐστὶν [ἐνέργεια], ἐπιστήμη[ς] τῶν θείων εὐπορία καὶ (ἡ) (τοῦ θεοῦ κατανοήσεως (θείου ὄντος τοῦ κρατῆρος).

---

[1] Cf. the expression repeated in *3 En* 42–48: הלכתי אצלו ותפשני בידו והראני·

»λόγος, o Tat, [the Creator] imparted to all men, but not νοῦς (Spirit). Not that he grudged it to any; for the grudging temper does not start from heaven above, but comes into being here below, in the souls of those men who are devoid of νοῦς . . . [The Creator] filled a great *basin with [νοῦς] and sent it down to earth*[1]; and he appointed a herald, and bade him make proclamation to the hearts of men: [Hearken, each human heart;] dip yourself in this basin, if you can, *recognising for what purpose you have been made,* and believing, that *you shall ascend to Him who sent* the basin *down.* (Scott: »Perhaps 'Him who sent *you* down to earth'».) Now those who gave heed to the proclamation, and dipped themselves in [the bath of] νοῦς, these men got a share of γνῶσις; they received νοῦς, and so became complete men. But those who failed (to heed) the proclamation these are they who possess λόγος indeed but have not received νοῦς also. And these, inasmuch as they *know not* for what purpose they have been made, nor by whom they have been made, are held under constraint by anger and incontinence; they admire the things that are not worth looking at; they give heed only to their bodily pleasures and desires, and believe that man has been made for such things as these. But as many as have partaken of the *gift which God has sent,* these, my son, in comparison with the others, are as immortal [gods] to mortal [men]. They embrace in their own νοῦς all things that are, the things on earth and the things in heaven, and even what is above heaven, if there is aught [above heaven]; and *lifting themselves up* to that hight, they see the Good; such, my son, is the work that νοῦς does; it throws open the way to knowledge of things divine, and enables us to apprehend God.»

---

[1] This may be compared with the idea of the Divine Efflux — δωρεὰ τοῦ θεοῦ treated of above on 3^5 p. 67.

Then Tat expresses the desire to be baptised in that manner, in the νοῦς, and receives the answer: »If you do not first hate your body, you cannot love yourself; but if you love yourself, you will have νοῦς, and having νοῦς, you will partake of knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) also . . . It is not possible to attach yourself both to things mortal and to things divine; . . . the choice of the better is glorious for the chooser; for it not only saves the man from perdition, but also shows him to be pious towards God . . . You see, my son, *through how many bodily things in succession we have to make our way, and through how many troops of demons and courses of stars that we may press on to the one and only God* . . . Let us then . . . make our way thither with all speed; for it is hard for us to forsake the familiar things around us, and *turn back to the old home whence we came* (ἐπὶ τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ ἀρχαῖα ἀνακάμπτειν).

The '*libellus*' ends: 'In these outlines, my son, I have drawn a likeness of God (τοῦ θεοῦ εἰκών); and if you gaze intently upon this likeness with the eyes of your heart (τοῖς τῆς καρδίας ὀφθαλμοῖς). then my son, believe me, *you will find the upward path* (τὴν πρὸς τὰ ἄνω ὁδόν); or rather, the sight (*codd:* the likeness) itself will guide you on your way; for the [divine] (*codd:* the sight) has a power peculiar to itself; it takes possession of those who have attained to the sight of it, and *draws them upward* (ἀνέλκει) even as men say the loadstone (ἡ μαγνῆτις λίθος) draws the iron.

Special attention must be called to the Mandæan conceptions of the descent and ascent of the Messenger-Saviour and their import. It will necessary here to make quotations from Mand. Literature at some length.

GR, Third Book, containing a relation of creation, composed of different fragments. The first two of these are dominated by the contrast between the [First] Life, [קאדמאייא] הייא, and the Second Life, תיניאניא הייא. The First Life is opposed to the creation planned by three Uthras generated by the Second Life. To frustrate this Manda dHayye is *sent down*. The narrative is continued by a new fragment relating Manda dHayye's fight with and victory over Ruha and her son Ur, the King of Darkness. After his victory Manda dHayye *ascends again* to the [First] Life. A fourth fragment speaks of the *descent* of Ptahil from the Second Life. Ptahil is commissioned with the creation. When Adam has been created and received his Spirit from the House of the First Life, the three Helpers Hibil, Šitil and Anoš are created(?) by the First Life and given the function of guarding the Spirit of Adam.[1] This short résumé of the contents of *GR III* may be deemed sufficient to illustrate the frame in which the following passages, speaking of the descent and ascent, occur.

GR III, 69$^{8-13}$ (*Pet* 73$^{2-5}$)

הזית ד̄שבאק בית הייא ואזבאר אנפאיון לאתאר השוך שיבקו לצאותא ד̄הייא
וצאותא ד̄השוכא רהים שיבקויא לאתרא ד̄זיוא ונהורא ואזאל ריהמויא לדאורא
באטלא

»(The Life speaks to Manda dHayye:) Thow sawest that they (*i. e.* the Uthras) left the House of Life and directed their face towards the place of Darkness; they abandoned the company of Life and loved the company of Darkness; they left the place of splendour and light and went (avay and) loved the worthless abode.» Here the descent of the Uthras is viewed under the aspect of a fall.

GR III 70$^{16\text{ f.}, 23, 30\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* 74$^{1\text{ f.}, 5, 8\text{ f.}}$)

כוי האזא אמארליא הייא כיגדית ושאבית לרורביא ... על דקאיימנא באתאר
כסיא ... מן קודאם ד̄ניהון עותריא אנא אסגית לאתאר השוך

»(Manda dHayye speaks:) When the Life said this to me I made obeisance and praised the Mighty (Life) ... while I was standing in the hidden place (*i. e.* the House of Life, the Highest World) ... before the Uthras were, I *went to the place of Darkness.*»

GR III 71$^{33\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* 75$^{2\text{ f.}}$)

אנא כוי הזאיתינון עהידרית לבית אבו

»When I saw them (*i. e.* the rebels, the evil powers of the lower world) I *returned to* (my) *Father's house.*»

GR III 72$^{7\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* 75$^{6-8}$)

אנא האיזין עיאכגיא להאך דוכתא לאתרא ד̄השוכא ובהשוך דעוצבא דנהורא
ליתבה̄

---

[1] *Vide* Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, pp. 63—65.

»(Manda dHayye speaks:) How shall I proceed to that place, to the place of darkness [and in darkness] in which there is no ray of light?»

GR 75^{10-12} (*Pet* $77^{12\text{ f.}}$)

כיי תיזאל להאך אתרא תאפרישינון לראהמאך תאפרישינון לבהיריא זידקא

»(The Life speaks to Manda dHayye:) When thou goest (down) to that place, do thou teach thy friends, the Bhire Zidqa (men of dependable, tested faith, technical term for the believers).»

GR $79^{16, 23\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* $80^{5\text{ f.}, 8\text{ f.}}$); also *GR* $87^{34\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* $86^{10\text{ f.}}$)

אזיל על מארדיא דהשוכא . . . טאבא בטאבותה ניסאק ניחזיא לאתאר נהור

»(The Great Life speaks:) Go forth against the rebels of darkness ... *the good shall* in (on account of) his goodness (virtue) *ascend and behold the place of light.*»

GR 79^{35-37} (*Pet* $80^{14\text{ f.}}$)

כוי האיזין אמארליא רביא אנא בהאילאיהון אסגיט לאתאר השוך לאתרא דשרין בישיא

»When the Great (Life) had spoken thus to me, I went away through his power to the place of darkness, to the place where the evil ones have their abode.»

GR 91^{11-18} (*Pet* $88^{24}-89^{4}$)

אתיא הדא ברא רחימא דמן כאנפי דזיוא עצטאראר מן באנפיא
דזיוא ודמותה מנאטרא באתרה אתיא בערותא דהייא ובפאקאדתא דאבויה
פאקיד אתא בלבושא דעשאתא האיתא ומאסגיא על אלמאך

»(Manda dHayye speaks to the Evil One, Ur:) There comes (shall come) *one beloved son* who was formed out of the bosom of the splendour and whose *image* is preserved in its place; he comes with enlightning of life and with the command that his *father* commanded him; he comes in the garment of living fire and *descends to* thy world.»

GR III $94^{29}-95^{2, 6-15}$ (*Pet* $91^{14-17, 19-23}$)

בערותא ותושביהתא אסגית עולית לבית רורביא בהאדותא דהאדינא עשתאיילון
לרורביא רביא הדין ועתקאיאם והדוביא מן ריש בריש הייא לגאט טאבותאי
ואנפישויא לזיואי על דעתליא . . . הייא בהאדותון מאליל לעותריא אמריא להאילא
דגאבריא שאבא דמיא בגו נירא להאילא דגאבריא דשאבא דנורא דדילה לאהטאת
נורא לאהטאתאבה עותרא בערותה באר עותרא באר בערותה ודירכא
לשאלמאניא תראץ

»(Manda dHayye speaks of his return to the Highest World, the House of Life:) With enlightenment and praise I went and *ascended to the House of the Mighty (One):* in the joy with which I rejoiced I conversed with the Mighty (One). The Great (Life) rejoiced and was confirmed, it rejoiced in me (on account of me) greatly greatly; the Life rendered me gratitude and increased my splendour . . . the Life in its delight spoke to the Uthras: praise ye the power of (this) man who (preserved?) water in (through?) fire; praise the power of that man, whose fire did not sin; the fire did not sin in him; the Uthra (= that man, Manda dHayye) shone in his enlightenment, the Uthra shone in his enlightenment and *he established a path for the perfect(ed) ones.*» It is apparent that the real subject of the section from which the above passages have been quoted, is a soteriological one. Manda dHayye *descends* in order to teach and strengthen the Bhire Zidqa and he *ascends* having established a path for the perfect ones, on which 'the good in virtue of his goodness shall ascend and behold the Place of Light'.

The fourth book of *GR* preserves fragmentary variants of the same idea. The central figure is here Hibil-Ziu̯a, who is characterized as the *first-born son*, ברא בוכרא, of Mandā dHayye and the Great (Life) — *GR* 147 $^{5\text{ ff.}}$ (*Pet* 132 $^{1\text{ ff.}}$) and who descends to the 'world(s) of darkness' by commission from his fathers.[1] The object of his descent is expressed by the following utterance by Hibil-Ziu̯a at the end of the book:

GR 147 ^{35}—148 ^{5} (*Pet* 133 $^{5-10}$)

כושטא ניסבית ביאמינאי ואסגית לאלמא דהשוכא אבא דקאם בהאימאניתא
ועבא דנאפישה באתאר בדור האשביא האלין דקאם בהאימאנותא סאלקיא
האזילה לאתאר נהור האלין דלאקאם בהאימאנותא מיכאף סאיפיא ליומא דסוף

I took Kušṭa in my right hand and went to the world of darkness; one (*i. e.* some) stood firm in faith, one (*i. e.* others) retained himself (themselves) in the world of darkness. Those who stood firm in faith shall ascend and behold the place of light, those who did not stand firm in faith will be brought to an end at the day of the End.

---

[1] *GR* 147 $^{32\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* 133 $^{2\text{ f.}}$) ... אמינטיל ד̄אנא שימית וקאבלית ולאבארבית מינדאם ד̄אבאהאתאי אמארליא »because I listened to and accepted and did not make vain what my fathers had commanded (lit. said) me», cf. Jn 12 $^{49,\,50}$.

The fifth book (first section) of *GR* treate of the same theme.[1] The time is, with the exception of the concluding lines, all through pre-Adamitic. The descending Saviour is Hibil-Ziu̯a (or Hibil-Ia̯u̯ar), who speaks of the Highest Being Mānā and his feminine 'Image', דמותה, in the terms of Father and Mother.[2] The Saviour's work is done in several descents and ascents through different worlds of darkness, and he is represented as having a number of Uthras as helpers among which are Šitil and Anoš. The Rulers of Darkness are Ruha, and, later, her son Ur, who, with the 'calling forth' of the earth evidently plays the rôle of the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (Jn 12^{31} 14^{30} 16^{11}).[3] Although the descents of Hibil are pre-Adamitic, they nevertheless picture the descent of the Spiritual-Celestial-Human into the Lower World. The difference between the former and latter is really this, that whereas the Hibil-Ziu̯a type, the 'Son', is not dominated by but dominates the powers of the lower world (cf. Jn 14^{30}, ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν), the human or earthly beings have been subjected to the domination of the Prince of Darkness. The Saviour's work is to free the enslaved human beings from this domination.

GR $152^{31\,f}$ (*Pet* $136^{19\,f}$) ואמרוא עזיל בראן ודמותן דצאותה שאניא מן כולהון עותריא אמינטול דאתרא דאנאת אזלאתלה עבא נאפשא האוילאך באלמיא הינון דהשוכא ... [*GR* $153^{25\,ff}$ (*Pet* $137^{19\,f}$)] ואנא יאואר היביל עמרית הא בהאילאיכון דילכון אבאהאתאי ובהאילה דראזא רבא ואדיאוריא דמינאי עהות השוכא ... [*GR* 163^{13} (*Pet* 152^{1})] והאילאך אנא ואלמיא ודאריא דמינאי מאלוין ואמארנאלון הדון ... דאבאדנין עסתאדראת האשתא קים ניסאק ניזאל לואת אבאהאתאן וניהזיא מאניא יאקריא וניהזינון למאנא ודמותה ולניטובתא ראבתיא דאנין מינה הואינין מאסגיני ואזלינין ... כוי מטאינין אלמא דבית מיצריא פתאהינון לבאביא דנהורא וקודם אב סליקנין והו מאנא ודמותה אלאנפאיאן נאפקין

---

[1] Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 149, calls this book »das wichtigste Stück des mandäischen Schrifttums über den Abstieg des Erlösers in die Unterwelt», and says: »Bei der Charakterisierung der finsteren Mächte, der Schilderung ihres Treibens und ihres Verhaltens dem überirdischen, fremden Manne gegenüber zeigt die Darstellung eine Höhe, die sonst in der mandäischen Literatur nicht erreicht ist».

[2] As in the fourth book also Mandā dHayye is the Saviour's father, (and at the same time called his 'brother' = equal). Cf. Lagrange, *Gnose Mandéenne*, *RBI* xxxvi p. 333.

[3] Cf. Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 150.

ועניאנא קאריליא ואמריליא האיניאתיא היביל מאנא ד̄נפיש זיוה מן
כולהון עותריא... [*GR* 164^{13} (*Pet* 153^{14})] אנא קידם אב סאגדנא
ואמארנאלה̄ אנאת אב בריכית ומשאבית ד̄האזא עותא עהאבתליא
וניהתית להשוכא וסילקית לאלמיא ד̄נהורא לואתאיכון אתית
ובצאותאיכון יאתיבנא... [*Pet* 154^{6}] כדי האזא מאסגינא יאזילנא מאטית
בית מיצריא החשוכא ... [*Pet* 155^{5}] ישבאקתה וסילקית ועזלית ליאת
אבאהאתאי החייא שיהלין יהוית אלפא דשניא ליאתאיין יקאמית
קידאמאיהון... ואנא אמארנאלהון הא מאטיא זיבנא דבאיינא מאסגוייא
לאלמא האך ד̄אנתון יאדיתון ואמריא הייא אבאהאתאי קום עזיל בראן
בוכראן ד̄מסאדארלון לכולהון אלמיא... [*Pet* 156^{18}] אנא לקודם
אבאהאתאי סילקית... [*Pet* 157^{10}] ואמארנאלון לחייא ולמאנא ודמותה̄
מאן החאילה כבאר יצאותא דילכון דשאניא וכאביריא האילא ד̄אנאתון
עהאבתוליא ואדיאריא דאנאתון נצאבתוליא מן מאהו דאהילנא. וכיסיא
דאנאתון כסאיתינאן אנא לאהאייקנא מינאיהון.. בדהצאנא דילכון
אלמא ליותה̄ ד̄מאטית ויאתבית ועשתאיית מינאיהון כדי הדא מינאיהון
... [*Pet* 157^{20}] אנאתון בעדותא ומאדיתא וגאליותא ד̄גלעיא בעצראיכון
קריתוליא ואמארתוליא ואפרישתון ונצאבתון להאנאתא השוכא
שאדארתון לדיליא מן קודם דתיהויא עמה̄ ואבויא ד̄עור ומן קודאם
דאבאהאתון ניהון אהאדתינון לכולהון באביא ושאניתינון לכולהון
סיכריא דלואת הדאדיא לאזליא

»And (Hibil-Ziu̯a's father) said: Go, go, our son and image whose splendour transcends that of all the Uthras! For the place to which thou shalt go, a long time you will have to wait in those worlds of darkness... I, I̯au̯ar-Hibil said: 'Lo! By your power, my parents, and by the power of the Great Mystery and (with) the helpers that are with me I shall descend (to) the Darkness... [follows narrative of Hibils descent and subsequent ascent through the various worlds of darkness, those of (a) Ruha, (b) Zartai-Zartanai, (c) Hag and Mag (= Gog and Magog), (d) Gaf and Gafan, (e) Anatan and Qin, (f) Šdum, (g) Krun; until Hibil-Ziu̯a and his helpers arrive at the upper boundaries of the lower world; then the text continues:] ... I and the worlds and æons that were attached to me (accompanied me), and *(sic)* I said to them: 'Rejoice'... what we have done (our work) is put in order. Now, arise, let us ascend and go to our parents and behold the glorious manas and behold Mana and his image and the great Niṭubta from whom we are (come forth). We ascended and proceeded; when we reached the world of the house of boundary, we opened the gates of light and ascended before the Father, and he, Mana and his image, came to meet us, and, calling me, addressed me and said to me: 'Lo, here he comes, Hibil-mana, whose splendour transcends that of all the Uthras! »... I [Hibil-Ziu̯a] prostrated myself before [my] Father and said to him: 'Thou, o Father, blessed and praised be thou that thou hast given me this enlightenment; (and) *I have descended* to the Darkness and *have ascended* [again] to the worlds of Light, I have come to you and am now sitting in your company' ... [Then follows a second descent:] After this I [Hibil-Ziu̯a] proceeded and went [down] and reached the House of boundary of the Darkness ... [whereupon there is again an ascent:] and I left her [*i.e.* Ruha, the female ruler of the Darkness] and ascended to my father(s), namely the Life, [who] had sent [me] down, and remained with him (them) thousand (of) years and stood before him (them)... and then I said to him (them): 'Lo, the time has arrived that I shall proceed and go down (again) to the world that thou knowest'; thereupon Manda dHayye my Father, said: *'arise, go [down], our first-born son,* who puts all worlds in order. [Follow the third descent-and ascent:]... I ascended [to and stood] before my Parents. [The 'Parents' tell him, that they have been anxious lest he should loose his celestial power, his 'Mana' or 'Inmost', while dwelling in the lower world; Hibil-Ziu̯a relates:] I said to the Life and to Mana and his image: 'He whose power is strong [*scil.* does not fear; and such a one I am]; because of your splendour, so great and strong, [and] the power that you gave me and the helpers that you procured for me, whom should I fear? Because of the concealment in which you did hide me, I was not afraid of them. In your trust (*i.e.* trusting you, *scil.* I remaind secure] until I reached [that place] and seated myself with them and was made [in appearance] as one of them ... In your enlightenment and knowledge and the revelation which you revealed in your mind, you have created me; you have spoken to me and taught [me] and planted [me]; you sent me to that Darkness before the father and mother of Ur were, and before their parents were; I shut and closed all the gates and barred them all, so that they cannot go to each other.» In all, seven descents are narrated. At the fourth Ur, as the Prince of Darkness, is born, at the sixth he is put in fetters by Hibil 'till the time of Abathur', *i.e.* till the creation of the earth, which latter is viewed as a fall of the Light; at the seventh descent Adam is created, with a body from the seven Planets and a Spirit from the First World, the House of Life. This, as being typical, may be quoted here:

GR V 1 176^{31}—177^{5} (*Pet* 172^{10}):

עתהא׳שאבית אנא יאואר אמארנא עבאר אדאם קראלון לשיביאהיא
ואמארנאלון ׳שאיין דמותא דפגריה ושאוין כוי דאמארילון ואנא איתיתה לנישימתא
מן גינזאיהון דהייא רורביא ה̄הוא כאביא בית ניטופתא דרבאת בתאנא ורמיתיבה
בגאוה̄ דפאגרא ד̄אדאם ואבאדילה̄ האוא זאוה ונעתיאיאר ונעתראיאם אלמא
האזין ואנא עהויא תאגנארא דנישמאתא דהאכא מיתיאדלא ולהיל מיתקיריא
עותריא וסאלקיא האזילה לאיאר באראיא ולאתרא דמינה עתינציב ואלמא דשלים
בעלה ד̄אלמא האזין וסאלקיא האזילה̄ לאבוהון קאדמאיא הייא לאגטיא טאבותא
דמאנדא דהייא והיביל בירה̄ דהי מסאדארלין סידראיהון להייא לרורביא עקארא

»I, Iauar, planned and said: 'I will make Adam'. He [*l:* I] called the seven planets and said to them: 'Form ye (the image of) his body'. And they formed [it] as I had said to them. And I brought forth from the treasur[i]es of the mighty Life the Spirit... which was hidden in the house of Niṭufta and grew (*or* had grown) in Tanna and I threw it into the body of Adam; and I made for him Hauua, his wife, in order that this world might be enlightened and lifted up. I shall be the procurer of the spirits who are born here and are called Uthras there [in the world of Light] and who shall *ascend* [and] behold the outer 'Ayar [= ether] and *the place from which they were created* (*or* brought forth). And until the measur[ed time] of this world shall have been completed and they *shall ascend and behold their First Father,* the Life pays gratitude to Manda dHayye and his son Hibil who arranges the orders for the Mighty [and] Glorious Life.»

Examples of other celestial Figures spoken of in terms of descent and ascent are (1) the 'Youthful Child, the Great Righteous Unique (*or* Only Begotten) One', ראביא טאליא ליהדאיא רבא זאדיקא, *GR IX,* 236^{30} (*Pet* 235^{21}). The Youthful Child is also identified with Hibil, son of Adam, although not of the terrestrial Man, but of the Celestial Adam[1], *i. e.* he is the Celestial Son of Man: *GR X* 243 (*Pet* 242). (2) Hibil, Šitil and Anoš together, as the

---

[1] 'He was not begotten of 'an [earthly] man's semen' says *GR* 243^{25} (*Pet* 243^{11,12}) ראביא טאליא ד̄באוירא ד̄גאברא לאעזדרא. It is quite in keeping with this, when Hibil is elsewhere called the Son of Manda dHayye, or even of the Life.

'three messengers' or 'helpers'; especially prominent in *MLi.* (cg. 13^{3} 19^{11} 20^{1} 103^{12} also *GR* 109 e. a.). (3) Anoš-Enoš alone, the stress being laid on the significance of 'Man'; important references: *GR* 29 and 47, XV 295 ff., already referred to, and *MJoh* sectt. 74 and 76. (4) the Watchers or Guardians of the different ages; as such are mentioned Anoš, Hibil, Sam-Ziu̯a (*GR XV* cf. *MJoh,* sectt. 25 and 49), and, in general, the various messengers from the World of Light[1], especially prominent in the fifteenth and sixteenth books of *GR.* (5) Adakas, called also Adakas-Ziu̯a, Adakas-Mana and Adakas-Malala.

A quotation of a hymn representing the category of messengers mentioned under (4) above may be apposite here. Thus in *GR XVI* 389^{21}—390^{9} (*Pet* 366^{18}—367^{3}) an anonymous[2] messenger is introduced, speaking as follows:

מן אתרא דנהורא נפקית מינאך דאורא תאקנא מיגאש לילביא אתינא להאנדוויא ולנאבוייא עוצריא כולהון מיחזיא בליבה̅ דמאנו איתאן ועל מאנו שרינאלה̅ על עוצרה̅ דראניביא רניבה̅ ואדכאר שומאי עיאדכאר שומה̅ ד̅באיילא לבותאי מן תיביל אנא עבייא לבותה̅ מן אתאר אנהור ד̅באייא בותאי ותושביהתאי אנא עבייא דנאפישא וכאבירא עלה אתית ואשכיתינון על לילביא כשיטיא ותהאימניא כיי אנא לאהוית בינאתאיהון שומאי על פומאיהון רמיא ליגטית ואסיקתינון לואת עותריא ד̅יוכאבאר קרא ואמארנאלון שאלמאניא באסים ריהאיכון ובינאתאיכון זיוא שריא

»*From the place of Light I have come forth;* from thee, o glorious abode; to feel the hearts I come, to measure and test all inclinations (*or* minds); to see in whose heart I am, and in whose mind I dwell; he who thinks on me, on him do I think, he who mentions my name, his name shall I mention; he who prays my prayer from Tibil (the earth), his prayer I shall pray from the place of light; he who prays my prayer and (utters) my praise, for him I shall pray opulently and greatly; I have come and have found the true and faithful hearts; when I was not among them [before I was in their midst] my name lay on their mouth; *I took [them] and lifted them up to the Uthras* [which] Yokabar has created; and I said to them! O, Perfect ones! Your scent is fragrant and splendour rests among you.»

In such a connexion as this the function of the messenger is to bring a message to those mortals, who in their Spirit preserve a sensibility for the World of Light, who carry within them a longing for their eternal home — and to take them with him up to the abodes of the Uthras.

---

[1] These are sometimes termed Mana, sometimes Uthra, sometimes they carry other names or are anonymous.

[2] A preceding hymn gives Manda dHayye or, more properly, his 'Voice', as the speaker, but the situation is different from that of the present section.

A peculiar character adheres to Adakas. This name, acc. to Lidzbarski[1], is shortened for *Adam kasi̯a,* the hidden Adam. Adakas represents the inner man, the celestial or Divine essence in him, that part which belongs to, has emanated from, the world of light. To express the essential unity of all that has emanated from the Celestial World, or the unity of the individual spirits in the Spirit, he is also represented as the original father of all the spirits, or as the head of all the generations.[2]

Behind this there is the conception of the spirit in the individual man as reaching, or being combined, at least potentially, with the First or Highest or Original Spirit, who is also the First Celestial Man; that is to say, the same idea that was traced above as underlying Jn 1^{51}. This idea is also expressed by the use of the word 'Mana' both for the Inmost in man, and for the Highest Being. The essential or constitutive trait of Adakas is, however, that he took up earthly, bodily existence, entered the bodily Adam[3], אדאם ד̄פאגריא[4], 'became flesh'.

Some passages from *GR* and one liturgical piece from *GL* may be quoted, in order to show the various ideas inherent in the Adakas-conception. The aspect of descent and ascent is prominent also here, but it has a different colouring from that of the Messenger-Saviour-traditions hitherto under consideration.

It may be appropriate to begin with a passage where Adakas is represented as giving account of himself:

---

[1] *Ginza* p. 486, note 2.

[2] Cf. the characterization of Adakas by Reitzenstein in *Iran. Erlös. Myst.* pp. 48, 49: 'Bezeichnet Adam nun auch die sichtbare Erscheinung des ersten Menschen, so kann man sein unsichtbares Teil, die eigentliche Persönlichkeit, den verborgenen Adam, nennen und diese Benennung wird so häufig, dass sich für sie eine eigene Abkürzung bildet, Adakas ... [dann] begreift man sofort, dass auch Adakas für den göttlichen Boten eintreten muss; er ist der verborgene Mana, der aus seinem Ort gekommen ist, die Seele, das Wort, aber auch das Gesetzt und das Haupt, nämlich das Haupt der Generationen; ... es ist der Stamm der Seelen, der vor der Schöpfung der Welt zusammen mit der ersten Seele geschaffen ist und bis zum Ende der Welt besteht, weil ohne ihn die Welt nicht bestehen kann.»

[3] This seems not to have been sufficiently emphasized by Reitzenstein and Lidzbarski.

[4] *GR* 247^{9} (*Pet* 246^{18}).

GR X 246$^{1-15}$ (*Pet* 245$^{13-23}$)

שום דיליא רישא אדאכאם מאנא כאסיא ד̄מן אתרה̄ אתא ניבטא שומאן
ואלמא דנימוכא קארילא נישימתא קארילא מאנא מכאנאליא פאריא פאריאתא
קארילא נהורא קארילא ניהמאת הייא שומאן ותאנא שומאן ועשאתא האיתא
שומאן ואנא שומאי כאסיא דמן בית הייא ואדאכאם אנא זיוא דמן אתרא כאסיא
אתא ואתיויא אהאי עותריא בניא נהירא . . . עשתאדאר עלאי ואתיון ובאנפאי
קנאבליא מותא מן דאורא דפאגריא דרביתיבה אלבשין זיוא וכאסיון נהורא
ד̄מן תאם עשתאדאר עלאי מן בית הייא . . . ואפקון לבית הייא.

»[Adakas speaks:] 'My name is the *Head*[1], *Adakas,* the *hidden Mana,* who has come from his place; Nibṭa is our name, the *world of Law* they call me; *Spirit* they call me, the epithet of Mana they give me, the redeemer of redemption they call me, the *Light* they call me, *Life's Groan*[2] is our name, and Tanna is our name and the *Living Fire* is our name. I am my hidden Name [*or:* I, my name is hidden], for *I come from the House of Life,* and Adakas I am, the Splendour, (Ziṷa), who has come from the hidden place; and *my brethren, the Uthras, brought me here* . . . they were sent to me and they brought me here. *They decreed on me* [the punishment of] *death*[3] from the abode of corpses [terrestrial bodily existence] in which I grew up; they *clad me in splendour*[4] and covered me with light that was sent down on me from there, from the House of Life . . . and *they brought me to the house of Life*'.»

GR III 112$^{36\text{ ff.}}$ (*Pet* 104$^{4\text{ ff.}}$)

נישאבא לאדאכאם זיוא לאבא ד̄מינה הוא . . . שאבא לאבויא אדאכאם זיוא
למאנא ד̄מינה̄ עתינציב . . . [*Pet* 104^{18}] כוי שאלימלה̄ בעלה̄ מאסיק תאריצלה̄

---

[1] Cf. *GR* 117$^{32\text{ f.}}$ *Pet* 107$^{22\text{ f.}}$) בריש שורבתא קאדמאיתא אדאכאם זיוא הוא »at the head of the first generation was Adakas Ziṷa», and the references in passages quoted below to Adakas as the one who created Adam, or brought spiritual human life into Adam and Haṷṷa, or 'sowed the seed' into the earthly womb. Adakas is the First Spirit to enter terrestrial life, and in him all the spirits who have taken earthly bodies are inherent; in reality they are all begotten by him, and hence, carries his Mana, or the Mana, in them.

[2] »Life's Groan» most probably refers to the longing of the Spirit [who has come down from its home in the House of Life to the earthly existence] for its eternal origin. The powers of the earthly world are felt by the awakened spirit as a heavy burden under which it groans.

[3] This clearly shows that the connexion with a mortal body is essential in the conception of Adakas. Adakas is the Mana in so far as it has 'become flesh and blood'.

[4] *i. e.* after the death of the earthly body. As Adakas ascends to the house of Life so shall the awakened Spirits of his tribe or generation also ascend.

בבינתה תאריצלה באתאר נהור לואת אבויא אדאכאס זיוא ומשאוילה עותרא
באתאר נהור.

»May he [Adam] praise Adakas Ziu̯a, the Father, from whom he is [come forth] . . . *He* [Adam] *praised Adakas Ziu̯a, the Mana, from which he had been created*[1] . . . when his [Adam's] measure will be completed, he [the messenger] will *cause him to ascend* and will establish him in his edifice, establish him in *the place of Light with his father Adakas Ziu̯a* and *make him an Uthra in the place of Light.*»

GR III 110^{25} (*Pet* 102^{18})

כיי מאמלילבה זיוא דהייא אדאכאס זיוא לאתרה סליק

When the *Splendour of Life spoke in him [Adam]*, then *Adakas Ziu̯a ascended to his place.*[2]

GL II 18; 486^{18}—487^{4} (*Pet* 61^{13}—62^{1}).

יא אדאם כאסיא מן בית הייא מאן אתיאך . . . מאן שאדאר
אשריאך בגו תיביל יבית בילדבאבאך מאן איתבאך . . . אי עדא
עלאך רורביא אי עדא עלאך רביא מן בינאתאיין לאפאקדיך . . .
מאליל אדאם כאסיא דנימארלה לגאבריא דשאילה אב מידא יאדא
עלאי רביא . . . על אלמא דעתיתלה לאעשכא דליבאטלה.

»[An Uthra, messenger from the Life, says to Adam Kasi̯a:] 'O, thou hidden Adam [Adam kasi̯a = Adakas], who brought thee from the House of Life? . . . who sent [thee] and caused thee to dwell in Tibil and to sit in the house of thy enemies? If the Mighty One had known of thee, if the Great One had known of thee, he would not have commissioned thee from with him! . . . Adam kasi̯a spoke and said to the man who had asked him: '*Verily,* o, Father, *the Great One knows* of *me . . . but the worla to which I have come [down] cannot be made nought.*[3]

---

[1] Adam is created from Adakas, Adakas is the Father of Adam, in the sense that Adam, properly speaking, did not exist as a human being, 'with spirit in him', until Adakas descended into him. By Adakas' descent into Adam, Adam's individual spirit was born. This spirit ascends to the House of Life and dwells with its father, Adakas Ziu̯a.

[2] That the splendour of Life speaks in Adam means that he has been wakened up to a recognition of his celestial nature and spiritual home. Thereby the communion with his spiritual home is established: Adakas Ziu̯a ascends to his place.

[3] Again the close conjunction of Adakas with the earthly human existence is involved.

GR X 245 10—12 (*Pet* 244 13—15)

מינאי דיליא עשתארהאב שורבאתא בתיביל והוית דזירא זארא
במארבא דנשיא

»[Adakas speaks:] 'From Me the generations [tribes] were spread in Tibil, and it was *I who sowed the seed* in the womb of the women.»[1]

GR 244 14—39 (*Pet* 243 8 – 244 6)

אדאכאס מאנא דמן אתרא כאסיא אתא ונפאלבה באדאם והאוא
זאוה ואקמה לאדאם ולהאוא זאוה על ליגראיהון ואנהאר אינאיהון
למיהזיא... והאילאך הינין שובא שיביאהיא... אמריא דלאנישמון
שותא דגאברא ניכראיא דאסגיא לכא ומן יולפאנה לאנילפון ומן
קבאל דאנין שאוינא לאדאם ניקום ונישתמאלאן לדילאן ולפתאהיל
אבוהן ושורבאתא דאדאם ניקמון וניפליהונאן לדילאן ולפתאהיל
אבוהאן ורהים גאברא ניכראיא דשותה ניכראיתא דמנאכריא
מינה מין אלמא ושרא מאנדא דהייא בעוצר ליבה דאדאם
ובאדאכאס מאנא דאתא ונפאלבה

»*Adakas Mana* who *came from the hidden place* and *fell into Adam and Hau̯u̯a,* his wife, and *raised Adam and Hau̯u̯a,* his wife, *on their feet*[2], and *enlightened their eyes in order to see* ... and then those seven planets ... said: 'They (Adam and Hau̯u̯a) shall not listen to the words of the strange man [Adakas] who has come here, and shall not learn [accept] his teaching; and since it is we who have created Adam, he shall arise and listen to us and to Ptahil, our father, and the tribes [generations] of Adam shall arise and worship [serve] us and Ptahil, our father. But now he loves the strange man whose words are strange and estranged from the world[3], and *Manda dHayye dwells in the*

---

[1] Adakas represents the inception of spiritual existence in bodies of flesh and blood.

[2] The descent of the Spirit from the Celestial World into mortal bodies is a 'fall'. This fall has, however, probably no moral import. Before Adakas' fall Adam and Hau̯u̯a were not human (-spiritual) beings: they belonged wholly to the world of the 'Seven'.

[3] The contrast here between the lower world and its beings, to which men also, by force of their bodily nature, belong, and the celestial world, to which men belong when recognizing, or waking up to, their spiritual relation to this world which latter is 'strange' to the beings of this world, may be compared with the Jn-ine expressions: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν ... καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ

treasury of Adam's heart and *in Adakas Mana who came and fell into him.*»[1]

The quotations from Mandæan literature given above will have tended to show quite clearly what import and connotation are attached to the descent and ascent between the Celestial and Terrestrial worlds. The central ideas are: (1) the spirits of men do not belong to this world, but have their home in the world of Light, (2) from the world of Light the spirits have come down to this world by a descent, (3) this descent is comprehended in the descent of the First Man, or the Hidden Man, Adakas, (4) the salvation consists in the ascent of the First Spirit and the individual spirits to their home, (5) this ascent can only be brought about through the descent from the world of light of a messenger-saviour, who makes the voice of Life heard to the spirits, *i. e.* wakes them up to recollect their celestial origin, and through the ascent of this messenger, by which ascent he prepares a path for the awakened spirits. (6) there are several messenger-saviours, the plurality in some contexts being traceable to a connexion with æon-conceptions; frequently the messenger is called 'son', 'the firstborn son', 'the Unique One', (7) the Power inherent in all the messengers is identical as is also their function; (8) since the different messengers in the *same* tradition are termed 'Unique' or 'Son' or 'Firstborn', it is evident, that it is really the Function of or Power inherent in — or given by the Mana or Life to — the messenger, that is intended by the said terms. (Cf. *Corp. Herm. I* 22 quoted below on 3^{16}.)

From this it follows, that Jn 3^{13} οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς could be applied with perfect adequacy to the Mandæan lore. Even the sequel, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, could, by substituting the corresponding Mandæan conception, be maintained to fall in naturally with the ideas referred to.

No parallel to the emphasis on exclusiveness appearing in Jn 3^{13} is, however, to be found in Mandæan literature. When read against the background of Mandæan representations, the exclusive tendency of Jn 3^{13} becomes especially striking, and can scarcely

---

ἔγνω (1^{10}), ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω (17^{25}), ὑμεῖς ἐκ τούτου τοῦ κόσμου ἐστέ, ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (8^{23}); εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει. ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστέ ... διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος. Ptahil here appears as the 'prince of this world'.

[1] Cf. Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erlös. Myst.*, p. 54 (commenting upon *GL* 113^{12}): »Weil Manda d'Haije der Urmensch ist, ist die aufsteigende Seele, der ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (Adakas), sein Abbild und er ihr Abbild. Erst in der Verenigung mit ihr kehrt er selbst wie zum Himmel zurück».

be interpreted otherwise than as a strong refutation of some current and prominent doctrine or belief of the time concerning the possibility of ascent into heaven. The doctrine in view cannot, however, have been any lore of the kind represented by the Mandæan salvation-mystery; in that case the formulation would have been quite different. The teaching addressed can evidently not have had for its tenets the pre-existence of spirit, his descent from heaven into earthly life, and, in particular not the inclusion of the individual spirits in the First Spirit or First Man.

For the connexions implied by the assumption of such a refutation being intended by Jn 3 13 some other current ideas must be called attention to.

In the first place, then, it may be well to exhibit a few Rabbinic dicta relating to the descent and ascent of the Šekinā, *i.e.* the metonym for the Divine Presence.

Billerbeck[1] adduces as a parallel to the present Jn-ine passage a dictum by R. Yose ben Ḥalafta (about 150 A. D.): *TB Sukka* 5 a:

מעולם לא ירדה שכינה למטה ולא עלה משה ואליהו למרום שנא'
השמים שמים לה' והארץ נתן לבני אדם ולא ירדה שכינה למטה
והכתיב וירד ה' על הר סיני למעלה מעשרה טפחים והכתיב ועמדו
רגליו ביום ההוא על הר הזיתים. למעלה מעשרה טפחים. ולא
עלה משה ואליהו למרום והא כתיב ומשה עלה אל האלהים למטה
מעשרה והכתיב ויעל אליהו בסערה השמימה למטה מעשרה והכתיב
מאחז פני כסא פרשז עליו עננו ואמר ר' תנחום מלמד שפירש שדי
מזיו שכינתו ועננו עליו מכל מקום

»Never did Šekinā descend on earth nor did Moses and Elijah ascend on high, as it is written (Ps 115 16): »The heavens are heavens for YHUH, but the earth he hath given to the children of men».[2] [How can it be maintained that] Šekina never descended on earth? Is it not written (Exod 19 20): 'And the Lord came down upon mount Sinai'? [Answer:] There was a distance of ten fingers' breadth [between Šekinā and the mount]. But is it not written (Zech. 14 4): 'And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives'? [Answer:] Nevertheless it is to be understood that he remains at a distance of ten fingers' breadth. [How can it be maintained that] Moses and Elijah did not ascend to heaven? And, lo, it is written (Exod 19 3): 'And Moses went up unto God'. There was a distance of ten fingers' breadth. But, lo, it is written (2 Ki 2 11): 'And Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven'. Even here it is to be understood that he did not ascend higher than that there was a distance of three fingers' breadth. For, lo, it is written (Hiob 26 9): 'He holdeth back the face of his throne, and spreadeth his cloud upon it'. R. Tanḥum said: this teaches us, that the Holy One spreads of the splendour of his Šᵉkina and clouds it round about.»

---

[1] ii 425.

[2] Billerbeck quotes only as far.

Since Šᵉkina means the Divine Presence among the terrestrials, a dictum implying that Šᵉkinā never descended on earth is impossible. It is also apparent, that the intention of the passage here quoted is simply to convey that the Divine Glory can never be fused into or amalgamated with the terrestrial world. The traditions concerning the descent and ascent of Šᵉkinā are further illustrated by the following passages:

'Aƀ. dᵉR. Nāþ. 34:

עשר ירידות ירדה שכינה על העולם אחת בגן עדן שנאמר וישמעו את
קול יי׳ אלהים מתהלך בגן ואחת בדור המגדל שנא׳ וירד יי׳ לראות
את העיר ואת המגדל ואחת בסדום שנא׳ ארדה נא ואראה הכצעקתה
הבאה לי ואחת במצרי׳ שנ׳ וארד להצילו מיד המצרים ואחת על
הים שנ׳ ויט שמי׳ וירד ואחת בסיני שנ׳ וירד יי׳ על הר סיני לעיני
כל העם ואחת במקדש שנ׳ ויאמר יי׳ השער הזה יהי׳ סגור ולא
יפתח וגו׳ כי יי׳ אלהי ישראל בא בו ואחת בעמוד הענן שנאמר
וירד יי׳ בענן ואחת שעתידה להיות בימי גוג ומגוג שנאמר ועמדו
רגליו ביום ההוא על הר הזיתים : עשרה מעלות נסתלקה שכינה
ממקום למקום מכפורת לכרוב ומכרוב למפתן הבית וממפתן הבית
לשני כרובים ומשני כרובים לגג ההיכל ומגג ההיכל לחומת עזרה
ומחומת עזרה למזבח וממזבח לעיר ומעיר להר הבית ומהר הבית
למדבר. וממדבר נסתלקה כלפי מעלה

»There are ten descents of the Šᵉkinā to the world: (1) to the garden of Eden *Gen* 3 8 (2) to the generation of the Tower of Babel, *Gen* 11 5 (3) to Sodom, *Gen* 18 21 (4) to Egypt *Exod* 3 8 (5) on the sea *Ps* 18 9 (6) on Sinai *Exod* 19 20 (7) on the temple, *Ezek* 44 2 (8) in the pillar of the cloud, *Num* 11 25, (10) in the future Šᵉkinā will descend in the time of Gog and Magog, *Zech* 4 14 [the ninth descent is missing in the text]; in ten stages the

Šᵉkinā ascended, from one place to the other, viz. from the mercy-seat to the kᵉrub̄ and from the kᵉrub̄ successively to the threshold of the Temple, the two kᵉrub̄im, the roof of the Hall, the wall of the Court, the altar, the town, the Mount of the Temple, the Desert, and from the desert the Šᵉkinā ascended on high.» The ascent refers to the Šᵉkinā departing from the Temple destined to be destroyed.

ExR 2:

א"ר שמואל בר נחמן עד שלא חר' ב"ה היתה שכינה שורה בתוכו...
ומשחרב ב"ה נסתלקה השכינ'... ר' אלעזר אומר לא זזה השכינה
מתוך ההיכל... א"ר אחא לעולם אין השכינה זזה מכותל מערבי...
א"ר ינאי אע"פ ששכינתו בשמים עיניו יחזו עפעפיו יבחנו בני אדם...
אע"פ שהיא נראה כמסלק שכינתו מב"ה עיניו יחזו עפעפיו יבחנו
בני אדם

»R Šᵉmu'el bar Naḥmān *(3rd gen. Pal. Am.)* said: until the destruction of the Temple Šᵉkīnā rested in the midst of it... and with the destruction of the Temple the Šᵉkīnā ascended... R 'Elʿāzār said: The Šᵉkīnā did not move from the Temple... R 'Aḥa said: the Šᵉkīnā did certainly not move from the Western Wall... R Yannai said: even if His Šᵉkīnā is in heaven, 'his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men' (*Ps* 11 4)... even it seems as if he had removed his Šᵉkīnā from the Holy Temple, 'his eyes behold, his eyelid try, the children of men'.»

TB Bāb̄ā Bāṗrā 25 a:

רבי אושעיא סבר שכינה בכל מקום דא"ר הושעיא מנין שהשכינה בכ"מ
שנאמר אתה הוא ה' לבדך אתה עשית את השמים וגו' שלוחיך לא
כשלוחי בשר ודם שלוחי ב"ו ממקום שמשתלחין לשם מחזירין שליחותם
אבל שלוחיך למקום שמשתלחין שם מחזירין שליחותן שנאמר התשלח
ברקים וילכו ויאמרו לך הננו יבאו ויאמרו לא נאמר אלא וילכו
ויאמרו מלמד שהשכינה בכ"מ. ואף ר' ישמעאל סבר שהשכינה בכ"מ
דתנא דבי ר' ישמעאל מנין ששכינה בכ"מ שנא' והנה המלאך הדובר
בי יוצא ומלאך אחר יוצא לקראתו אחריו לא נאמר אלא לקראתו
מלמד שהשכינה בכ"מ

»R. Hōšaʿyā *(1st gen. Pal. Amora)* held that Šᵉkīnā is every-where; for thus says R. Hōšaʿyā: whence do we know that the Šᵉkīnā is everywhere present? It is written (*Nehem* 9^6): 'Thou, even thou, art Lord alone: thou hast made heaven etc.' Thy messengers are not like the messengers of earthly men. The messengers of earthly men bring back their message to the place from which they are sent out. But thy messengers bring back their message (report at) the place to which they were sent. As it is written (*Job* 38 35) 'Canst thou send lightnings, that they may go, and say unto thee, Here we are?' It is not written 'that they may *come* (back) and say' but 'that they may *go* and say', which shows that the Šᵉkīnā is everywhere present. And R. Išmaʿel also held that the Šᵉkīnā is everywhere present; for there is a Bāraiþā from the school of R. Išmaʿel [running as follows]: Whence do we know that the Šᵉkīnā is in every place? From [*Zech* 2 3]: 'and, behold, the angel that talked with me went forth and another angel went out to meet him'. '*After him*' is not written here but '*to meet him*', teaching that the Šᵉkīnā is everywhere.»

Pesiq. 1 b, *GenR* 19 13, *CantR* on 5 1

א"ר אבא בר כהנא מהלך אכ"כ אלא מתהלך מקפץ ועולה עיקר שכינה בתחתונים היתה. כיון שחטא אדה"ר נסתלקה שכינה לרקיע הראשון חטא קין נסתלקה לרקיע השני. דור אנוש לג' דור המבול לד'. דור הפלגה לה'. סדומיים לו' ומצרים בימי אברהם לז'. וכנגדן עמדו ז' צדיקים. ואלו הן אברהם יצחק ויעקב לוי קהת עמרם משה. עמד אברהם והורידה לו'. עמד יצחק והורידה מן הו' לה' עמד יעקב והורידה מן הה' לד' עמד לוי והורידה מן הד' לג' עמד קהת והורידה מן הג' לב' עמד עמרם והורידה מן הב' לא' עמד משה והורידה מלמעלה למטה... הרשעים לא השכינו שכינה בארץ.

»R. Abbā bar Kāhᵃnā (*3rd gen. Pal. Am.,* disciple of R. Yōḥᵃnān) said [with reference to *Gen* 3^8]: It is not written here *mᵉhallēk* (walking) but *miþhallēk*, in order to convey the sense: he was about to ascend (*lit.:* leapt and ascended]. Originally Šᵉkīnā was among the terrestrials. As soon as the First Man sinned, Šᵉkīnā retired to the first heaven; with the sin of Qain it removed to the second heaven, with that of the generation of Enoš to the third, of the generation of the deluge to the fourth, of the generation of the confusion of tongues to the fifth, of the Sodomites to the sixth, of Egypt in the time of Abraham to the seventh.

Corresponding to those [sinners] there arose seven righteous men: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Qehath, Amram and Moses. When Abraham arose, he caused it [the Šᵉkīnā] to descend to the sixth heaven, Isaac to the fifth, Jacob to the fourth, Levi to the third, Qehath to the second, Amram to the first, [at last] Moses arose and caused it to descend from above to below [*i.e.* to the terrestrial world again, as in the beginning] . . . The wicked do not cause the Šᵉkīnā to dwell on the earth.»

The ideas of the descent and ascent of the Šᵉkīnā in Rabbinic are inextricably interwoven with those of the righteousness and sinfulness of men. The ascent of the Šᵉkīnā is a symbol of Man's severance from the Divine through his sin.[1] A generation of men, or the people of Israel, or individuals, enjoy communion with the Deity in measure as they are good, pure, righteous and humble.[2]

The ascent and the descent of Šᵉkīnā are in such connexions as these also viewed as the ascent from and descent to earthly men of Celestial Nature and Eternal Life. Thus, when acc. to the dictum quoted above the Šᵉkīnā ascends from on earth to the first heaven with the sin of the first Adam, this is to be put in relation to the wide-reaching speculations on the Celestial Nature of the First Adam before his sin. These speculations show traces of a conception of the 'First Adam' אדם הראשון as being the Celestial Original Man, in many features resembling the conception of Adakas-Ziu̯a of Mandæan literature. Thus Āđām hā-Rišōn is co-extensive with the whole world[3], possesses celestial Splendour, *Ziu̯*, celestial Light, *'Orā*[4], and also [celestial?] strength or Power *(Tōqæf)*.[5] With Adam's sin these are removed from him, or, as it is explicitly stated, taken up to heaven by the Holy One to be preserved for the righteous in the world to come. The idea of the descent and ascent of Š^{e}kīnā is here so prominent as to exclude any representation of the descent and ascent of the Celestial or First Man. Thus it is interesting to notice that the attainment of salvation and eternal Life is viewed primarily from the point of view of the Š^{e}kīnā's coming down among earthly men.[1]

---

[1] On this cf. Abelson, *Immance of God in Rabbin. Lit.* pp. 135—142.

[2] *TB Qid.* 70 b, *Šab* 92 a, *Ned.* 38 a. For »Šᵉkīnā dwelling with an individual (or Israel)» *vide TB Sota* 3 b for »ascending from an individual (Ester)» *vide TB Megilla* 15 b, adducing *Ps* 22^{1}.

[3] *TB Ḥag* 12 a.

[4] *GenR* 12_{5}.

[5] *GenR* 21_{4}:

ר׳סימון פתח תתקפה לנצח ויהלך משנה פניו ותשלחהו תוקף שנתן הקב״ה
לאדה״ר לנצח לעולם היה ויהלך כיון שהניה דעתו של הקב״ה והלך אחר דעתו
של נחש משנה פניו ותשלחהו

»R Simon *(3rd gen. Pal. Am.)* opened [his discourse with reference to *Hiob* 14^{20}:] 'Thou made him strong for ever and he went (away); thou didst change his countenance and send him away'. The strength (power) which the Holy gave the First Man was for ever, *i.e.* it was intended to be his eternal possession.

It is evident, that Jn 3^{13} cannot primarily be directed against the Jewish conceptions of the descent and ascent of Š^{e}kīnā. It is true that Jn sees the Š^{e}kīnā embodied in the Son of Man; the conception of Jn could, no doubt, be expressed thus: there is no descent of the Š^{e}kīnā except in the Son of Man: Jn $1^{14, 18}$. Nevertheless the formulation of Jn 3^{13} shows that it is directed not against the theory of the descent of the Divine among men, but against some theory of an ascent or ascents into heaven. It was shown above, that the theory thus rejected cannot be the conception of the Saviour-Messenger's or the Spirit's ascents into heaven as contained in the salvation-mystery. Hence there is only one conception known that can possibly be intended in the controversial utterance, viz. that assuming that certain especially gifted or saintly men had ascended or could ascend on high while still on earth. The particular bearing of the theory rejected can be conjectured from the context of Jn 3^{13}. The preceding context contains two ideas connected with the ascent into heaven; viz. the vision of (or entrance into) the Kingdom of God, the highest realm of the celestial world [3^{3}] and the knowledge of the Celestial realities [τὰ ἐπουράνια; 3^{12}]. Now the vision of the heavens, especially the highest heaven, the Divine Abode, and the knowledge concerning Divine Secrets of Past, Present and Future derived

---

As soon as he abandoned the knowledge of the Holy One and went after the knowledge of the Serpent, then 'thou didst change his countenance and send him away'. [The same view R Simon supports by a reference to *Hiob* 12^{18}].»

[1] *Tanḥ Hay. Bem.* 20:

לעולם הבא כשאחזור שכינתי לציון אני נגלה בכבודי על כל ישראל ורואים אותי
והיים לעולם

»In the time to come, when I shall bring my Š^{e}ḵīnā back to Ṣion then I shall be revealed in my glory to all Israel and they shall then see me and *live eternally*. Similary, acc. to *TB Ber* 17 a, the righteous in the world to come will enjoy the *splendour of Š^{e}ḵīnā* which was taken away from the first generation Cf. *3 En* 4—6.

therefrom, are precisely the central features of the ideas in Jewish Apocalyptic and, at the time of Jn, also in some of the Merkaba-ecstatic circles. The ideas of the former are too well-known to need any special résumé here. With regard to the Merkaba-mysticism, a distinction must be made between the esoteric, or Merkaba-experiences proper — which really were a salvation-mysticism — and the popular or coarsened theories about the Merkaba-mysticism[1] dwelling upon the external form of the Merkaba-traditions. The controversial formulation of Jn 3^{13} would, no doubt, best apply to the latter, coarser form. In this connexion also such typical representations of the ascent of the spirit as those of the so-called *Mithras-Liturgy* and *Corp. Herm. I* must be taken into consideration.[2] Further the utterance of Jn 3^{13} must be put in relation 2 Cor 12^{2-4}.

Before concluding the question on the controversial bearings of Jn 3^{13} it will be necessary to investigate into the positive bearing of the passage. In view of the background for its teaching suggested above, it is apparent, that the passage, in common with preceding passages referring to the Son of Man, conveys the *essentiality of the Son of Man.* This essentiality may here be expressed thus: *There is no ascent into heaven apart from the Son of Man.*

The essentiality of the Son of Man does not, however, imply an exclusiveness. The literal meaning of the passage, which seems indeed to imply such exclusiveness, is impossible. The whole context revolves on the idea of entrance into the Celestial World; and the subject is the question how a man can enter the Kingdom of God, which is answered to the effect, that if a man be born from above, he enters the highest celestial realm, In relation to the context the intent of Jn 3^{13} is simply to bring out the *essentiality of the Son of Man for man's generation from above: there is no birth from above apart from the Son of Man.*

---

[1] Cf. Abelson, *Jewish Mysticism,* pp. 33—39, ctr. pp. 40 ff. The difference between the two is very marked, and, strangely enough, obtains down to mediæval times. The popular or coarse Merkaba speculations and trainings revolve on the three themes of ecstasis, magic and abstruse revelations.

[2] These may be said to be representative. It is of no avail to reproduce here again the various representations in Greek and Hellenistic literature and Gnostic systems of the ascent of the spirit. For conspectuses of these representations reference may be made to Dieterich-Weinreich, *Eine Mithras-Lithurgie*^{3} pp. 170—212, Lietzmann, *Komm. 2 Cor,* Exkurs. on $12^{2\,\mathrm{ff}}$, Windisch, *id.,* pp. 374 ff. G. P. Wetter, *SG* pp. 101 ff. SAngus, *Myst. R. and Chr.* pp. 103, 107, 140.

This import, necessarily, brings with it the *inclusive* aspect: no man can enter the Kingdom of God without the Son of Man, but *with or in the Son of Man it is possible to ascend to heaven.* This idea is in keeping with Jn-ine thought, cf. $14^{2-4, 6, 23}$ etc.

At this point it will be possible to decide in what relation Jn 3^{13} stands to 2 Cor 12^{2-4}. Although Jn, as will be further dwelt upon later, does not seem at all to uphold any ecstatic views with regard to the way of communion with the Divine, it will appear that Jn 3^{13} cannot be controversially directed against 2 Cor 12^{2-4}, since both have one essential idea in common, viz. that the ascent to heaven is made in the Son of Man (Paul: in Christ); the man who can in reality ascend to the Celestial world is 'a man in Christ' (οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ ... ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ). This is clearly brought forth also by 2 Cor 12^{9}: ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Paul always, whether in heaven or on earth, moves in Christ: Christ's Šᵉkīnā dwells with him [ἐπισκηνώσῃ].

Jn 3^{13} naturally recalls also *Rm* $10^{6\text{ ff.}}$ and *Eph.* $4^{6\text{ ff.}}$. In *Rm* $10^{6\text{ ff.}}$ Paul says: ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει. μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν· ἤ· τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τοῦτ' ἔστιν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν.

Here the ἀνάβασις of an individual is midrashically connected with the κατάβασις ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ of Christ; the implication alluded to as associated with the main intent of the passage is that an ἀνάβασις with the object of Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν is no longer necessary: although ascended, Christ is present with the man who carries the belief in him in his heart, Christ's power dwells with him (2 Cor 12^{9}). It may not be out of the way to compare with this the predominance of the idea of the Šᵉkinā's descent over that of man's ascent in certain Rabbinic conceptions.[1] With the latter part of the Pauline passage the idea of Christ's descent to [and ascent from] the world of the dead is touched upon (cf. 1 Pet $3^{19\text{ f.}}$). For this must be referred to the discussion below or Jn 5^{25}.

Eph $4^{7\text{ ff.}}$ introduces the terms of ἀνάβασις καὶ κατάβασις in a connexion nearer to the central ideas behind Jn 3^{13}: Ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

---

[1] Above page 94.

διὸ λέγει [quoting, Ps 68 19] ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ᾐχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, ἔδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη τί ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς; ὁ καταβὰς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα. The first thesis here may be said to be that the reference in *Ps* 68 19 to the ἀνάβασις is an adumbration of the ἀνάβασις of Christ. The second thesis is identical with that of Jn 3^{13}: the ἀνάβασις presupposes the κατάβασις and both are properly applied to the one man and son of God: Christ. Thirdly, however, the ἀνάβασις and κατάβασις of Christ are brought in connexion with the believers; the gift (δωρεά) of Christ from above to the believers is that of their growing into him, becoming part of him, thereby partaking also of his Life or very being. This is brought out in vss. 13—16: μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς **ἄνδρα τέλειον**, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ **αὐξήσωμεν** εἰς **αὐτὸν** τὰ πάντα ὅς ἐστιν **ἡ κεφαλή**, Χριστός, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον . . . This, it will be observed, is congenial with the interpretation of Jn 3^{13} as including in the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου also the believers. The simile is parallel to that of Jn $15^{1 \text{ ff.}}$, conveying the same sense: vs. 5 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα . . . χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν.

The bearing of this essential-inclusive import of Jn 3^{13} on the preceding context may now be summed up as follows: no one has ever entered or can ever enter the Kingdom of God, nor ascend to the highest realm of the celestial world, without being united [through faith] with the Son of Man; but in order so to enter the Kingdom of God one must become a new being: be born from above from the Divine Efflux in the spirit; *this Divine Efflux, the Celestial Life-generating outflow, is infused by the Son of Man,* who descended from heaven. *The teaching of Jn 3^{13} is hence directed against the theories maintaining that man earthly can ascend to heaven without the Son of Man and obtain knowledge independently of him.* The theory addressed is probably in the first place Jewish to judge from the context where the controversy is with a Jew. Thus Jn 3^{13} seems to imply the rejection of the traditions of ascensions into heaven made by the great saints, patriarchs and prophets of old (ἀναβέβηκεν, has ascended), such as Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Isaiah, and also of the views of those who at the time maintained that they could ascend to heaven and obtain knowledge of Divine Things and therefore had no need of the Son of Man. It might not be deemed impossible, indeed it is highly *probable, that Jewish opponents would argue against the essentiality of the Son of Man by pointing to the traditions of the experiences of the patriarchs and prophets,* just as they are represented as pointing to them in other similar controversies (cf. especially Jn 8).

The question arises, however, whether the controversial position of Jn 3[13] implies the rejection altogether of the spiritual experiences of those saints of the Old Testament. The answer will be that such a rejection is not implied. The issue is with the theories of opponents basing upon the said tradition, not with the celestial character and experiences of the patriarchs and prophets.[1] The Jn-ine retort to those opponents would be formulated to the effect that even the saints and prophets could do nothing without the Son of Man; if they ascended to heaven it was in the Son of Man, in union and communion with him. This is indeed alluded to by Jn 8[56 ff.] Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη . . . πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί. The rejection of current gnostic and similar representations of ecstatic ascensions into heaven, was, on the other hand, no doubt, unqualified, in so far as they would imply the possibility of such ascensions with the help of each their own χειραγωγός. It may be suggested, however, that the conceptions here in view, were rather those of the more popular, rude form, than, for instance, a representation of the kind found in *Corp. Herm.* IV reproduced above[2]; with the latter Jn really has very much in common; and his possible arguments against that kind of speculations take a different form. The very best survey of the various forms of the popular, rude notions to be considered is given by Wetter[3], and to that survey must be referred here.

It has been shown that the import of Jn 3[13] is organically connected with the preceding passage and that the same sphere of ideas underlies the whole context. It will only be natural to surmise that the same connexion of thought applies to the following context. In particular, it may be suggested, this general sphere of ideas must be brought in relation to 3[14, 15] **καὶ καθὼς Μοϋσῆς** ὕψωσεν τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων, ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. The question to be decided is: what is the *primary* connotation of the ὑψωθῆναι. It is universally recognized that the ὑψωθῆναι has the double significance of referring to »the future elevation» of Jesus »on the cross» and his »glorification; the elevation on the Cross being» for him »the pathway to his restoration to his pristine glory».[1] There can, so it seems, be no doubt that the said double significance applies to the passage. The primary significance, however, might be arrived at by the application of the methodical rules hitherto used for the Jn-ine dicta. Thus, it may be maintained, there is here the usual essential-inclusive connotation of the term Son of Man, and, further, the ideas intended to be conveyed are in keeping with those of the context.

---

[1] Cf. Box, *Apocalypse of Abraham*, pp. 55 ff. *Test. of Abraham,* p. xviii.

[2] pp. 73—75, *Corp. Herm.* I 30, 32.

[3] Wetter, *Sohn Gottes* pp. 101—113.

The inclusive connotation of the Son of Man here must be seen in the unity of the believers with Him, adequately described by *Eph* as a unity of body where the Son of Man is the Head. Hence the ὑψωθῆναι may be referred not only, nor even primarily, to the future elevation of the Son of Man to his pristine glory — that is the second or final stage — but to an experience or a happening in the present with the Son of Man in relation to the believers. This experience, further, is connected with the πιστεύειν, and this again with the act of gazing upward, directing one's [spiritual] perception on high, to the Son of Man, [through the simile of the serpent of *Nu* 21^{8,9}]. The hypothesis then may be put forth, that the ὑψωθῆναι refers to a spiritual experience with the believer, in which the Son of Man as united with him and abiding in him, is elevated in the believer's experience, to his spiritual gaze, so that the believer is saved, *ascends*, in aspiring ever upwards, towards the δόξα, the 'image' of the Celestial Son of Man; the experience here intended is identical with that described by Jn 6^{44}: οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἐὰν μὴ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με ἑλκύσῃ αὐτόν. But also the second or final stage is inclusive for the Son of Man and his body: the believers; in this sense the ὑψωθῆναι relates to the glorification of the Son of Man in its 'final' sense, viz., through and after his death on the Cross.

---

[1] E. Carpenter, *JWr* p. 366, cf. 348 and 398. Similarly Bauer, *JEv*, p. 53 »auch dieser [der Begriff des ὑψοῦσθαι,] (ist) einer der bei Jn beliebten doppeldeutigen Ausdrücke. Zunächst nämlich besagt er . . . die Erhöhung zur Herrlichkeit; d. h. in den Himmel . . . Daneben aber umfasst er auch jene Erhöhung, welche die Voraussetzung der Erhebung in den Himmel ist, die Erhöhung ans Kreuz 12^{33} 8^{28}. Cf. Loisy, *Le quatrième Évangile*^{2} p. 166.

Correspondingly there is a final ascent of the believers, when they definitely and in the complete sense of the expression will be 'born from above', 'have eternal Life' (3^{14}); this is expressed in the passage adduced, Jn 6^{44}, by the words: κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. Cf. below *ad loc.*

This interpretation is confirmed by Jn 12^{32}: κἀγὼ ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν.

It is strange to note that the ideas and expressions occurring in Jn 3^{14} compared with those of the context and of 6^{44} and 12^{32} appear in almost identical form in *Corp. Herm.* IV 5 and 11 b quoted above.[1] Here those who have partaken of the Divine Gift (corresponding to the ὕδωρ of 3^{5}, cf. 4^{10} and ἔδωκεν of 3^{16}) are said to lift themselves up as far as to the highest heaven or above heaven [ἑαυτοὺς ὑψώσαντες] to behold the Good. The upward path is found by gazing intently upon the likeness of God[2] with the eyes of one's heart; the likeness, then, will guide the aspirant on his way, the sight will take possession of him and draw him upward (ἀνέλκει).

The constitutive difference is this, that according to the basical thesis of Jn the likeness of God is contained only in the Son of Man. No other object of vision can draw the perceiver upwards.

It is apparent, that, as Jn 3^{14} naturally connects with 3^{13} in its essential-inclusive use of the Son of Man, and thereby also with the idea of birth from above, it no less links up with 1^{51} and 1^{14}. The ideas meeting here are those of vision, aspiration, and ascent. Those who perceive the glory of the Son of Man as the glory of the only begotten of the Father, they are drawn upwards towards him in his celestial aspect; again, their upwards-tending aspiration, their believing in him (3^{15}) is met by Him through his conferring upon them the Divine Gift, the Divine Efflux, which gives them power to become children of God (1^{12}), to be born into the spiritual world, to ascend to heaven, to enter and behold the Kingdom of God.[3]

---

[1] p. 75.

[2] = the teaching imparted by Hermes.

[3] Cf. J. Kreyenbühl, *Evangelium der Wahrheit*, p. 448 [independent of the general research on the 4th Gospel]: »Wenn der Mensch ἐπουράνια erkennen will, so kann das nur dadurch geschehen, dass er selbst aus einem ἐπίγειος ein ἐπουράνιος wird. Was ist aber das höchste ἐπουράνιον im Sinne der Mystik und Gnosis anders, als das evige Leben, die Erkenntnis des allein wahren Gottes und des Gottesgesandten, der den wahren Gott verherrlicht und sein Werk vollbracht hat (17^{3}). Auch dieser höchste Inhalt himmlischer Erkenntnis kann von

Before proceeding to the further development in 3^{16-21} of the import of the organism of conceptions contained in 3^{1-15} it will be necessary to consider the question relating to the use in 3^{14} of the *symbol of the serpent* of Nu $2^{8,9}$.

From Jewish point of view the 'serpent' could not possibly be connected with the idea of salvation. The Rabbinic dicta on the serpent, נחש, show that one was much too preoccupied with the speculations on the evil import of the serpent figuring in the story of the Fall, Gen 3, to be able to use the word in any other symbolical sense. The technical term for the Serpent of the Fall is נחש הקדמוני, the Original [or First] Serpent. He is the symbol of envy [he envied the first Man his glory: *TB Sanh* 29 a], he introduced unclean or evil σπέρμα into mankind [*TB ʿAƀ. Z.* 22 b attr. to *R. Yoḥ^{a}nān*], he 'broke down the fence of the world' [*TB Ta'^{a}niþ* 8 a], it was in reality the serpent who first fell into sin and introduced evil into the world [*TB Sanh* 39 b], the serpent is the symbol of the evil inclination, יצר הרע [*Tanḥ. Ber.* 7]. The passage adduced by Billerbeck *ad loc.* is indeed representative of the general Rabbinic attitude to the symbol. Did that serpent [of Nu 2^{18}] kill or give life? [No, it is to be understood thus:] »When Israel gazed upwards and subjected their hearts to their Father in heaven, then they were healed; if not, they perished». (Cf. below.) That is to say, to the Rabbinic interpreters the 'serpent' of Nu 2^{8} in itself had no symbolical meaning, the only import of the 'setting up' of the serpent was to direct the eyes, *and hearts,* of the obedient Israelites *towards heaven.*

Also in Mandaitic the Serpent, *hiu̯i̯ā,* is the symbol of evil. Thus *GR* XV 4 (*Pet* 313^{16}) speaks of *hiu̯i̯ā rabbā d^{e}hu ʿUr mārā*

---

dem gewöhnlichen fleischlichen Menschen nicht erfasst werden, sondern der Mensch muss über dieses sein Wesen hinaus erhöht werden (ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). Wie die von Mose erhöhte Schlange für die Israeliten das σύμβολον σωτηρίας war, in dem die von Schlangen Gebissenen Heil und Rettung fanden, so liegt Heil und Rettung für den Christen nur in der Erhebung über den fleischlichen Menschen mit seinen Erfahrungen von Gericht, Tod, Verderben zum Glauben an das ewige Leben. Der Mensch muss erhöht werden, damit er als Erhöhter in sich selbst den Glauben habe an das ewige Leben. Das ὑψωθῆναι des Menschensohnes ist also dasselbe Bild wie das ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, wie das ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι ($3^{7} = 1^{13}$), und wie die Jakobsleiter und das μείζω τούτων in $1^{50\,f.}$ Nur der in seinem Wesen himmlisch, geistig, göttlich gewordene Mensch versteht das Himmlische, Geistige, Göttliche, und nur der über seine irdische Daseinsform hinaus erhöhte Mensch hat in sich selbst das Wesen und Prinzip des neuen, christlichen Geistes, das ewige Leben.»

d^{e}*hašōkā šumeh*, the great serpent whose name is Ur, the Lord of the Darkness. (Cf. *GR III* 86^{10} 88^{17}.)

Against this stands the well-known use of the Serpent, ὄφις, in the mysteries, and especially in Gnosticism, where the appropriation of the OT narrative of Nu $21^{6—9}$ meant the application of allegorical interpretations to the נחש mentioned there. Thus Hippolyt reproduces the speculations of the Ophitic sect, called Peratæ: »The gods of destruction ... are the stars which bring upon those coming into being the necessity of mutable generation. These ... Moses called the Serpents of the desert which bite and cause to perish those who think they have crossed the Red Sea (the water of destruction). Therefore ... to those sons of Israel who were bitten in the desert, Moses displayed the *true and perfect serpent,* those who believed on which were not bitten in the desert, that is, by the Powers. None then ... can save and set free those brought forth from the land of Egypt, that is, from the body and from this world, save only the *perfect serpent,* the full of the full [ὁ τέλειος, ὁ πλήρης τῶν πληρῶν ὄφις]. He who *hopes* on this ... is not destroyed by the serpents of the desert, that is, by the gods of generation ... He it is who in the last days appeared in Man's shape in the time of Herod ... This ... is the saying 'And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of Man be lifted up' Jn 3^{14}. After his likeness was the brazen serpent in the desert which Moses set up. The similitude of this alone is always seen in the heaven in light. This ... is the mighty beginning about which it is written. About this ... is the saying: 'In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him and without Him nothing was. That which was in Him was life' (Jn $1^{1—4}$) ... And if the eyes of any are blessed ... he will see when he *looks upward to heaven* the fair image of the serpent in the great summit (or beginning) of heaven turning about and becoming the source of all movement of all present things. And (the beholder) will know that without him there is nothing framed of heavenly or of earthly things or of things below the earth ... In this ... is the great wonder beheld in the heavens by those who can see.» Further, in V 17: »According to them [the Peratæ] the universe is Father, Son and Matter. Of these three every one contains within himself boundless powers. Now midway between Matter and the Father sits *the Son, the Word, the Serpent,* ever moving himself towards the immovable Father and towards

Matter (which itself is) moved. And sometimes he turns himself towards the Father and receives the powers in his own person, and when he has thus received them he turns towards Matter; and Matter being without quality and formless takes pattern from the forms which the Son has taken as patterns from the Father [ἡ ὕλη ἄποιος οὖσα καὶ ἀσχημάτιστος ἐκτυποῦται τὰς ἰδέας ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἃς ὁ υἱὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐτυπώσατο] . . . All things that are here are therefore the Father's types and nothing else. For if any one . . . has strength enough to comprehend from the things here that he is a *type from the Father on high transferred hither* and made into a body, . . . *he becomes . . . wholly of one substance with the Father who is in the heavens, and returns thither.* But if he does not light upon this doctrine, nor discover the necessity of birth, like an abortion brought forth in a night, he perishes in a night. Therefore . . . when the Saviour speaks of 'Your Father who is in heaven' he means him from whom the Son takes the types and transfers them hither. And when He says 'Your father is a manslayer from the beginning' (Jn 8 44) he means the Ruler and Fashioner of Matter who receiving the types distributed by the Son has produced children here. Who is a manslayer from the beginning because his work makes for corruption and death. *None, therefore. can be saved nor return (on high) save by the Son who is the Serpent.* For as he brought from on high the Father's types, so he again carries up from here those of them who have been awakened and have become types of the Father, transferring them thither from here as hypostasized from the Unhypostatized One. This, . . . is the saying 'I am the Door' (Jn 10 7). But he transfers them . . . to those whose eyelids are closed (*i.e.* to the celestial world), as the naptha *draws* everywhere the fire to itself — or rather as the magnet the iron but nothing else . . . Thus . . . the *perfect and consubstantial race* which has been made the image but nought else *is again led from the world by the Serpent, just as it was sent down here by him.*»[1]

It has been necessary to quote Hippolyt's reproduction of the views of the Peratæ at length, since the prominence of the symbol of the serpent in Ophitic gnosticism, within which the doctrines of the Peratæ fall, has probably been suggestive for the attempts to read a typological use of the word 'serpent' for Saviour — Logos — Son of God, into Jn 3 14. But for the Ophitic representations nobody wuld probably have thought of connecting

---

[1] Hippol., *Refut.* V 16, 17. F. Legge, *Phil.*, pp. 154—159.

Jn 3^{14} with the various representations in the mysteries of the function of the 'serpent'. When, *e.g.*, J. Grill[1] finds in Jn 3^{14} a typological allusion to (Dionysos-)Sabazios, on the ground that the the cult of the 'holy serpent' has a central significance in the Phrygian »Sabazios-religion», and as a support of this compares the »lifting up of Jesus» in Jn 3^{14} as a means of obtaining eternal life with the initiation ceremonies of the Sabazior-mysteries[2] as realizing the regeneration, this, it may be allowed, is rather far-fetched. The parallel lacks all significance unless it be assumed that Jn 3^{14} implies a typological use of the serpent as the symbol of Saviour. But precisely this assumption was to be demonstrated. On the other hand the said parallel lacks the most prominent feature of Jn 3^{14}, viz. the *elevation* of the serpent.

The speculation of the Peratæ quoted above would, however, be of importance for the decision of the present question, if it could be demonstrated that there was an older, pre-Johannine, stratum of traditions, interpreting *Num* $21^{8,9}$ and other O. T. passages in such a sense, that Jn could allude to those traditions in order to make clear what he intended by referring to the O. T. passage in question.

Now there need scarcely be any doubt that most of the interpretations of the O. T.-passages given in the former part of the quotation above (p. 102 ll. 10—18) are independent of Jn 3. Similarly it is quite certain that the interpretations given later in the exposition (above p. 102 ll. 19 ff.) are dependent upon the Fourth Gospel.[3] Some uncertainty, however, adheres to the interpretation of *Num* $21^{8,9}$ occurring in the earlier part (p. 102 l. 14) Δακνομένοις οὖν φησίν, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ ἐπέδειξε Μωϋσῆς τὸν ἀληθινὸν ὄφιν τὸν τέλειον, εἰς ὃν οἱ πιστεύοντες οὐκ ἐδάκνυντο ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, τουτέστιν ὑπὸ τῶν δυνάμεων. The introduction here of the expression εἰς ὃν πιστεύοντες recalling the πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων of Jn 3^{14} would suggest a dependence on Jn. But then it is possible that the wordings of the source used by Hippolyt might have been influenced by the later adaptations to the Jn-ine language[1] even in those parts which were, originally, pre-Johannine or pre-Christian. And it is not probable that the Gnostics in question, when trying to re-interpret the O.T. in the light of their doctrines, could have passed by *Num* 21^{8,9} or any passage containing the word נחש, 'serpent'. Hence it must be concluded that probably there existed a Gnostic interpretation — of pre-Johannine origin — of Num 21^{8,9} reading in that passage a reference to the »true and perfect serpent who was also the Mediator, the Son, the λόγος».

---

[1] *Untersuchungen,* ii, pp. 218, 219, note 653, and p. 293.

[2] Grill, *Untersuchungen,* ii p. 219 note 653: »Die bei der Einweihung in die Sabaziosmysterien den Mysten *durch den Schoss gezogene* goldene Schlange ... vergegenwärtigte den Akt der Vermählung des Gottes mit dem dabei als der weibliche Teil vorgestellten Gläubigen und zugleich der Zeugung eines neuen Menschen, eines gottverwandten Wesens im Mysten». Clem. Alex., *Protrept.,* ii 16, 2, Firmic. Matern., *De Error. Prof. Rel.* 10, cf. H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis,* p. 111, Hast. *ERE,* vol. xi, p. 406 v. *Serpents in the mysteries.*

[3] This is apparent not only from the quotation of Jn 3^{14} but also by the quotation of Jn 1^{1-4}, 8^{44} and the evident familiarity with the whole ideology of Jn 3.

The typological use of the ὄφις of Moses for the λόγος, the good and true, is found in the wellknown allegorical interpretation of *Num* 21^{7,8} in Philo's *Leg. Alleg.* ii 20 79: πῶς οὖν γίνεται ἴασις τοῦ πάθους; ὅταν ἕτερος ὄφις κατασκευασθῇ τῷ τῆς Εὔας ἐναντίος, ὁ σωφροσύνης λόγος . . . (81) ὃν ἂν οὖν δάκῃ ὄφις, πᾶς ὁ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ζήσεται· πάνυ ἀληθῶς· ἐὰν γὰρ ὁ νοῦς δηχθεὶς ἡδονῇ, τῷ τῆς Εὔας ὄφει, ἰσχύσῃ κατιδεῖν ψυχικῶς τὸ συφροσύνης κάλλος, τὸν Μωϋσέως ὄφιν, *καὶ διὰ τούτου τὸν θεὸν αὐτόν*, ζήσεται· μόνον ἰδέτω καὶ κατανοησάτω. Notable are the parallel antitheses: the Serpent of Eve v. the Serpent of Moses, the ἡδονή v. σωφροσύνη, the coporeal (σῶμα) v. the spiritual (νοῦς); Philo here moves in a sphere of conceptions quite different both from Jn and the Ophitic Gnosis; yet the similarity with the latter is striking, in so far as Philo sees in the serpent of Moses a symbol of the λόγος.

Next attention must be called to the way in which Justin makes a symbolical use of *Num* 21^{8,9}. Thus we find in Justin, *I Apol.* 60 the following: Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς Μωσέως γραφαῖς ἀναγέγραπται ὡς κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου οἱ Ἰσραηλῖται, καὶ γεγόνασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ἀπήντησαν αὐτοῖς ἰοβόλα θηρία, ἔχιδναί τε καὶ ἀσπίδες, καὶ ὄφεων πᾶν γένος, ὃ ἐθανάτου τὸν λαόν· καὶ κατ' ἐπίπνοιαν καὶ ἐνέργειαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ γενομένην, λαβεῖν τὸν Μωσέα χαλκόν, καὶ ποιῆσαι τύπον σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῦτον στῆσαι ἐπὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ σκηνῇ, καὶ εἰπεῖν τῷ λαῷ· Ἐὰν προσβλέπητε τῷ τύπῳ τουτῳ, καὶ πιστεύητε, ἐν αὐτῷ σωθήσεσθε. Here Justin evades the word ὄφις totally, and sees in the object of vision set up by Moses a τύπος of the Cross. Striking are Justin's insertion in the travested quotation of *Num* 21^{8} of καὶ πιστεύητε (as in Jn 3^{14} and in Hippolyt's reproduction of the speculations of the Peratæ) and the use of the term σωθήσεσθε (cf. Jn 3^{17} and *Wisdom of Solomon* 16 below).

---

[1] Cf., however, the similar introduction of πιστεύειν by Justin below.

In *Dial* 94, again, Justin maintains that the 'serpent' of *Num* $21^{8,9}$ was a symbol of the Original Serpent, the Evil One, and his being put on the 'sign' [נס σημεῖον] (*i.e.* the 'pole', which to Justin was a cross) was to adumbrate the coming salvation — by Him who was to suffer on that sign, the Cross — from the δήγματα (bitings) of the Serpent, the δήγματα τοῦ ὄφεως being the evil doings, the sins. Μυστήριον γὰρ διὰ τούτου . . . ἐκήρυσσε, δι' οὗ καταλύειν μὲν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ὄφεως τοῦ καὶ τὴν παράβασιν ὑπὸ τοῦ 'Αδὰμ γενέσθαι ἐργασαμένου ἐκήρυσσε· σωτηρίαν δὲ *τοῖς πιστεύουσιν* ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν διὰ τοῦ σημείου τούτου, τουτέστι τὸν σταυροῦσθαι μέλλοντα, ἀπὸ τῶν δηγμάτων τοῦ ὄφεως, ἅπερ εἰσὶν αἱ κακαὶ πράξεις, εἰδωλολατρεῖαι, καὶ ἄλλαι ἀδικίαι. To Justin, then, the *serpent* was in no way a τύπος of the Saviour, but, on the contrary, of the evil inclinations; what Justin saw symbolised by the serpent set up on the cross might be approximately expressed by Paul's word in *Gal* 5^{24}: οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ 'Ιησοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις.

In *Dial.* 112 Justin fiercely rejects the thought that the saving object of vision in *Num* $21^{8,9}$ could be the serpent: It must be the 'sign', which refers to the crucified Jesus: οἱ δ' ἐσώζοντο εἰς αὐτὸν ἀποβλέποντες. Ὁ ὄφις ἄρα νοηθήσεται σεσωκέναι τὸν λαὸν τότε, ὃν . . . κατηράσατο ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν, καὶ ἀνεῖλε διὰ τῆς μεγάλης μαχαίρας, ὡς Ἠσαΐας βοᾷ (*Isa* 27^{1}); καὶ οὕτως ἀφρόνως παραδεξόμεθα τὰ τοιαῦτα ὡς οἱ διδάσκαλοι ὑμῶν (the Jewish teachers) φασι, καὶ οὐ σύμβολα; οὐχὶ δὲ ἀνοίσομεν ἐπὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ σταυρωθέντος 'Ιησοῦ τὸ σημεῖον, ἐπεὶ καὶ Μωϋσῆς διὰ τῆς ἐκτάσεως τῶν χειρῶν σὺν τῷ ἐπικληθέντι 'Ιησοῦ ὀνόματι [*i.e.* Joshua], καὶ νικᾶν τὸν λαὸν ὑμῶν εἰργάζοντο (*Exod* 17^{8-13}).

Now, although Justin puts his symbolical interpretation of *Num* $21^{8,9}$ against a supposed literal interpretation from the Jewish teachers, it may be observed here, that his interpretation — save for the reference to the crucified Christ — approaches very nearly that of two so different Jewish sources as *Wisdom of Solomon* on one hand and the official *Mišna* on the other. Thus *Wisdom of Solomon* 16^{5-8} runs: καὶ γὰρ ὅτε αὐτοῖς δεινὸς ἐπῆλθεν θηρίων θυμός, δήγμασίν τε σκολιῶν διεφθείροντο ὄφεων, οὐ μέχρι τέλους ἔμεινεν ἡ ὀργή σου· εἰς νουθεσίαν δὲ πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐταράχθησαν, *σύμβολον ἔχοντες σωτηρίας*, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐντολῆς νόμου σου· ὁ γὰρ ἐπιστραφεὶς *οὐ διὰ τὸ θεωρούμενον ἐσώζετο, ἀλλὰ διὰ σέ, τὸν πάντων σωτῆρα.* καὶ ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ἔπεισας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ῥυόμενος ἐκ παντὸς κακοῦ . . . and it continues 16^{10} τοὺς δὲ υἱούς σου οὐδὲ ἰοβόλων δρακόντων ἐνίκησαν ὀδόντες, *τὸ ἔλεος γάρ σου* ἀντιπαρῆλθεν καὶ ἰάσατο αὐτούς and 16[12]: *καὶ γὰρ οὔτε βοτάνη οὔτε μάλαγμα ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς, ἀλλὰ ὁ σός, κύριε, λόγος ὁ πάντα ἰώμενος.*

Mišna RhŠ iii 8, again, referring both to the power of the outstretched hand of Moses and to the Serpent of *Num* 21[8,9] — just as Justin in *Dial* 112 cited above[1] — says:

והיה כאשר ירים משה ידו וגברו ישראל וגו' וכי ידיו של משה
עושות מלחמה או שוברות מלחמה אלא לומר לך כל זמן שהיו
ישראל מסתכלין כלפי מעלה ומש(ת)עבדין את לבם לאביהם שבשמים
היו מתגברים ואם לאו היו נופלים כיוצא בדבר אתה אומר עשה
לך שרף ושים אותו על נס והיה כל הנשוך וראה אותו וחי וכי
נחש ממית או נחש מחיה אלא בזמן שישראל מסתכלין כלפי מעלה
ומשעבדין את לבם לאביהן שבשמים היו מתרפאין ואם לאו היו
נימוקים

»'And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed [*Exod* 17[11]]. Does that mean that the hands of Moses made wars or ended wars? No, the [scripture wants] to teach you that as soon as the Israelites *direct their gaze on high* [towards the Holy One] and make their heart subservient to their Father who is in heaven, then they are victorious (strong) and if not, they succumb, just as with regard to the word that yon read [in *Num* 21[8]]: 'make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole' [נס; sign]; and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live, 'this does not mean that the serpent kills or makes alive, but that every time that Israel direct their gaze on high and make their heart subservient to their Father who is in heaven, they are healed and if not, they are destroyed.»

The well-known passage *Barn.* 12[5–7] in adducing the second of the 'testimonies' in question has no objection in referring the Serpent to Jesus. Just as the serpent of brass, although lifeless, 'dead', can make living those who are dead, if they 'believing hope' that he can do so, so Jesus, who died on the Cross, can make living those who believe in and put his hope on him. (Cf. Tertull. *Adv. Marc* iii 18.)

---

[1] The two passages and their application to the Cross are, as is well-known, regarded as belonging to the 'Testimonies'.

What is *common* to all the adduced instances of interpretations of *Num* 21 ^{8,9} from Wisdom of Solomon to Justin and the Ophitic doctrine of the Peratæ, including the Rabbinic Mišna, is the importance attached to the 'directing one's heart, one's gaze' 'beholding' 'believing' 'hoping', in general that attitude of the soul which is perhaps best expressed by the later, untranslatable, Jewish word כַּוָּנָה. (Cf. *M Joh* XIII quoted below om 3 ^{16}.)

It may be allowed to quote some instances of later Jewish mystical symbolical uses of *Num* 21 ^{8,9}, showing the peculiar developments of earlier speculations characteristic for that mysticism. 'Thus *Zoh.* iii 165 a runs:

והיה כל הנשוך וראה אותו וחי אמאי אלא כד סליק עינוי וחמי
דיוקנא דההוא דנשיך קא הוי דחיל וצלי קדם ה׳

»'And it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live'. Why? (= What does it mean?). Only this: when he lifts up his eyes and sees the image of the one who bites (= the evil one, the evil inclination) then he fears and prays before YHUH.»

Midr. ha-nNæ'ᵆlām, parasa חקת, end.

רזא דמלה׳ דהאי נחש הנחושת הוא רזא דיצ"הר ומשום הכי שתיי׳
מר"עה על נס והיה כל הנשוך והביט אליו וחי. למרמז דמאן דלא
אתהני מיצ"הר אלא כדי קיום הנפש מלב׳ דלהכי רמיז ביה הבטה
דלא מתהני ביה אלא בהבטה בעלמא וחי ומאי דאתהני טפי מכדי
חיותו לאו איהו חי אלא מת

»The mystical connotation of the word (relating to) this brazen serpent is the mystery of the evil inclination, and the reason why Moses our teacher, (on him be peace!), put it on a sign[1] and every one who was bitten and looked on it lived, is to convey a mystical symbol, viz. that he who makes use of the evil inclination only so far as is necessary for the preservation of his earthly life[2], he is here symbolised by the 'looking' for he does not enjoy (or make use of) the evil inclination more than as a looking into (= a passing visit into) the world[1], and he will live', but he who enjoys more than is necessary for the preservation of life, he will not live, but will die.»

---

[1] Thus נס is usually interpreted; not as 'pole'.

[2] Already acc. to Rabbinic teachings the evil inclination is that which brings about and sustains the life in this world; a man who has entered life earthly must needs use the evil inclination in order merely to live and act in this world.

YR iv 38 a

ויאמר ה' אל משה עשה לך יש ללמוד תחיית המתים מק"ו מנה'
הנחש' ומה נחש הנחשת שהמילו מיתה עשה בו הקב"ה חיים שנ'
והביט אל הנחש והי תחיית המתים שכולו חיי' עא"כו

»'And the Lord said unto Moses, make thee etc.' This is to give a teaching with regard to the quickening of the dead from the principle of a minori ad majus. When, with regard to the brazen serpent, who symbolizes the (serpent's) throwing forth death, (it is said that) the Lord made (the Israelites) living through the brazen serpent, as it is written 'when he beheld the serpent of brass he lived', how much the more (shall the Lord make living at the time of) the quickening of the dead, when all is life.»

Cf. *Zohar Ber.* i col. 83, *YḤ*, *Mal.* no. 46

מטה משה שנהפך ממטה לנחש וכן איפכא היא מטטרון אם זכו
ישראל מטה כלפי חסד לימינא ואם לא זכו מטה כלפי חובא דתמן
נחש אל אחר דתבע דמא לשפיך

»The rod of Moses that was changed from a rod into a serpent and vice versā refers to Metatron. If Israel are worthy (pure, righteous) he is a rod (= a support, a helper) corresponding to Mercy on the right side, if they are not worthy, he is a rod corresponding to guilt (and judgement) [on the side] where is the serpent, the אל אחר (other God), who lusts after the shedding of blood.» Cf. Jn 8 44: ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν: ἐκεῖνος *ἀνθρωποκτόνος* ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

The result of the investigation into the various interpretations of *Num* 21^{8,9} of the time may be summed up as follows: (1) there were interpretations current which applied a typological sense to the word 'serpent' as the symbol of the 'Saviour' or the λόγος, (2) other interpretations viewed the 'serpent' as well in *Num* 21 as elsewhere as the symbol of the evil, and the נס or also the Divine

---

[1] The sense is approximately that of the Pauline: οἱ χαίροντες ὡς μὴ χαίροντες, καὶ οἱ ἀγοράζοντες ὡς μὴ κατέχοντες, καὶ οἱ χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι. (1 Cor 7^{30,31}).

Word as the symbol of or as that which was to bring salvation from that evil, (3) a third cathegory of interpretations, especially those of Jewish origin, ignored the reference to the serpent and emphasized the obedience to the Divine Word, or the faith and aspiration towards God as the real object of symbolisation. Common to all was, however, as has just been pointed out, the emphasis put on the words (*Num* $21^{8,9}$) וראה (ἰδὼν) or והביט (ἐπέβλεψεν) especially in the sense of 'gazing *upwards*' and וחי (ζήσεται). Further it is notable, that the term 'gazing upwards', was early associated with those of '*hoping*' and '*believing*' and the word *Life* (ζωή) similarly connected with the idea of *salvation* (σωτηρία); this is prominent even in the pronouncedly Ophitic speculations of the Peratæ; it is especially significant that the Peratic reference to Jn 3^{14} evidently sees the central idea of that passage in the beatific vision — »in the great summit of heaven»[1] — of Him 'without whom there is nothing framed of heavenly or of earthly things or of things below the earth', with explicit reference to Jn 1^{3}, this vision being attainable only by those whose eyes are 'blessed' (μακάριοι) 'who are able to see' (οἱ δυνάμενοι ἰδεῖν), *i.e.* who are capable of spiritual perception.

If Jn 3^{14} be put in relation to what has thus been shown to be the main tendencies of the current interpretations of *Num* $21^{8,9}$ and, at the same time, in relation to the context, it will appear that also in Jn the aspects of 'believing' and 'life' occupy a central position, and that 'life' also here is connected with the conception of 'salvation'. The reference to the 'serpent' falls into a secondary plane. It may be deemed significant that Jn 3^{14} omits all reference to the 'looking on the serpent' as a means of life contained in *Num* $21^{8,9}$, although the sentence ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον in the latter half of the verse would seem to have required a parallel corresponding to the πᾶς ὁ . . . ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ζήσεται of *Num* $21^{8,9}$.[2] This omission would seem to suggest that Jn, in common with the Jewish interpreters, rejects all symbolical significance of the 'serpent of Moses' quā serpent. In fact, the symbolical significance is transferred from the ὄφις to the ὑψωθῆναι; hence, it may be concluded, although the elevation of the serpent is paralleled with the elevation of the Son of Man, *the serpent itself is not paralleled with the Son of Man.* The result is: there are four central conceptions in Jn $3^{14,15}$: (1) the ὑφωθῆναι, (2) the πιστεύειν, (3) the ζωὴ αἰώνιος = σωτηρία and (4) the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

---

[1] Thus framed on account of the genuine astrological basis of the section in question. Cf. Hippol. *Refut* V 15, 16 end, 17, and H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis* p. 150.

[2] *Ctr.* Hippol. *Ref.* V 16 ἐπέδειξε Μωϋσῆς τὸν ἀληθινὸν ὄφιν, εἰς ὃν οἱ πιστεύοντες οὐκ ἐδάκνυντο ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

There is, however, another pointed omission in Jn's symbolical use of *Num* $22^{8,9}$, viz. that of any reference to the נס σημεῖον; it is known what an important part the נס played in the Christian use of *Num* $22^{8,9}$ as an adumbration of the Cross (cf. the above quotations of *Barn.* and *Justin*, *IApol.* and *Dial.*); this omission, bearing all the marks of being intentional, would seem to convey that the primary significance of the ὑφωθῆναι should not be sought in the σταυρωθῆναι

At this point it will, however, be apparent what the ὑφωθῆναι connected with *Num* $22^{8,9}$, acc. to Jn $3^{14,15}$, positively signifies. The adumbration found in *Num* $22^{8,9}$ is the connexion between the *ὑψωθῆναι and the πίστις of believers as consisting in a lifting up of their hearts on high.* Jn $3^{14,15}$, thus, gives a hint of the way of *spiritual experience*, *by which eternal life is to be found.* It is the *quomodo* of the birth into the world of the Spirit from the point of view of beginning spiritual aspiration and experience. It is also the *quomodo* of the ascent (ἀνάβασις) into the spiritual world, which is necessary for, or equivalent with, being born from above. Hence Jn $3^{14,15}$ must be regarded as the natural continuation of the whole preceding exposition. In 3^{4-9} the subject is the entrance into the spiritual world as conditioned by a real birth of a spiritual organism through the spiritual generating power of the Divine Efflux from above, in 3^{10-13} the teaching is: no one can mediate this Divine Efflux except the Son of Man, who descends from the spiritual world, and lives in the spiritual world[1] and no one can ascend without him; this is really an introduction to $3^{14,15}$ treating of *the spiritual experience tending towards the spiritual birth*, the beginning ascent into heaven; and *this spiritual experience is described as an elevation of the Son of Man*, *scil.* by earthly man, and *a directing of man's spiritual gaze towards that lifted-up Son of Man by believing in him.* In him (ἐν αὐτῷ), then, the believer attains eternal life.

It might be observed, that the three divisions in the exposition of $3^{4\,ff.}$ just pointed out, are each dominated by a peculiar term of their own for the spiritual life in the spiritual world. Thus the first division speaks of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ with the epithet 'above' or 'on high', the second of the οὐρανός, the third of the ζωὴ αἰώνιος. The intention is, no doubt, to lay stress on them as referring to the same spiritual reality. The identification of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ with the οὐρανός (in its spiritual sense) is of similar import as the utterance in 18^{36} ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου . . . νῦν δὲ ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐντεῦθεν. The connexion of οὐρανός with ζωὴ αἰώνισς evidently has the object of assigning the final realisation of the ζωὴ αἰώνιος to the οὐρανός. It is a spiritual life in the spiritual world of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. The mediation of the eternal life to earthly man is hence necessarily viewed all through under the aspects of descent and ascent. *The germ of eternal life must be given from above through the Son of Man, and the attainment of the full realisation of this eternal life is conditioned by the ascent of the Son of Man, by his being lifted up in the experience of earthly man, believing in Him.*[1]

---

[1] Hence, acc. to this interpretation, the concluding words of vs. 13 ὁ ὢν εν τῷ οὐρανῷ, are not contradictory with the rest of the vs.

With this the significance of πιστεύειν is also brought into light. It is a spiritual attitude or faculty or activity that arises in man when the Son of Man has been lifted up to his spiritual sight.[2] It is to be noticed that πιστεύειν is not, or not only, conceived of as the condition or cause of the ὑψωθῆναι, but is contained in the object of the ὑψωθῆναι: *ἵνα* πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων. Again it may be suggested that πιστεύειν has an implication of upwards-tending aspiration, caused by the spiritual vision of the Son of Man lifted up (cf. 6^{40} ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον). There is, as has already been suggested, in the lifted up Son of Man to the experience of the earthly man, something that *draws him upwards to that Son of Man,* and with the Son of Man ascending, ultimately makes the believer ascend into heaven, into eternal Life: κἀγὼ ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν (Jn 12^{32}).

If thus the primary connotation of ὑψωθῆναι in 3$^{14, 15}$ is a mystical one, in referring to the elevation of the Son of Man to the spiritual vision of the believer, it must needs be emphasized that this 'lifting up' is *not* merely a *psychological experience,* or *an ecstatic vision* still less an *intellectual process;* with ch 3 the notion that the earthly mind, (the psychical processes), could see or know of the world in which this lifting up is enacted, has definitely been rejected. The ὑψωθῆναι belongs to the spiritual world, a world of realities altogether different from the world of psycho-physical phenomena. A mind that would remain in the latter world, could never experience a single fact of the spiritual world, could not receive the gift from above. The conclusion is that there must be something in man, latent perhaps, but nevertheless there, in which the birth from above can be brought about. This elusive something is hinted at by the word 'πιστεύειν'. Πιστεῦσαι is the first step on the Jacob's-ladder between heaven and earth. With the 'πιστεύειν' man has, in reality, stepped out from the ἐπίγεια into the ἐπουράνια as descended in the Son of Man. But this is, at the same time, the beginning of the ascent in the Spirit, where man is drawn upwards towards the ever ascending, the continually elevated Son of Man. And this ascent is *not an ascent in ecstatic vision* but *a real ascent*, the ultimate goal of which is the final glorification of the Son of Man, and in him, of the believer. Here the inclusive connotation of the Son of Man in relation to the believers is most emphatically brought out.

---

[1] Cf. Lindblom, *Das ewige Leben*, p. 277.

[2] Cf. Gyllenberg, *Pistis* ii p. 43.

In vs. 16 the other aspect of this inclusiveness is expressed, viz. that relating to the Father. **οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν [αὐτοῦ] τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν.** The Father gave his son to the world. Whereas it has been intimated before that the Son of Man brings down the Divine Efflux, the Divine Gift, to earthly man, it is here enunciated that the Son himself is the Divine Gift.

By this also a third aspect of inclusiveness is introduced. The Son comprises all that is sent down from the highest spiritual world in such a manner that he can be identified with it. It is evident that this is one of the central doctrines of Jn, and that Jn in this aspect sees one of the fundamental laws of the spiritual world, in which that world essentially differs from the terrestrial world. Whereas the terrestrial world appears as a world of differentiation, of separation, of things existing by the side of each other, the spiritual world on the other hand is a world of all-inclusiveness of realities existing in each other, penetrating each other, mutually identical. The essential mark of membership of the spiritual, Divine world, is, from this point of view, to be expressed by the word '*unity*'. Typical illustrations of this teaching are: ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή (Jn 14[6]), ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς (6[35,48]), ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (6[41]), ἐγώ εἰμι

ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς (6^{51}), ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (10^{30}), ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς (17^{11}), ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, *καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί*, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν [ἓν] ὦσιν, *ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ, ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας* ... καὶ ἠγάπησας αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἠγάπησας ($17^{21—23}$).

It remains to point out that just as the spiritual organism is a real organism, in a quasi-physical (in the want of a more exact word) sense, the spiritual world itself is not thought of as something beyond space and time; it must be admitted that the spiritual world, acc. to Jn, is manifested in some kind of space, allowing the application to it of spatial terms in a literal sense. The ascent of the spirit, even within the spiritual world, is a *real* ascent. The difference between existence in spiritual space and in earthly space is probably to be characterised by the universal unity and all-inclusiveness referred to above. This will account for the seemingly contradictory views e. g. of the relation between the descended Son of Man and his spiritual home, his abode with His Father, perhaps most strikingly illustrated by a comparison of 14^{10} with 14^{12} (... ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστιν ... ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτός v. ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι,) or by 3^{13} — if, as is probable, the last part is original — οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. The 'journey to the Father' (14^{12}), the ascent and descent, are evidently intended to be taken quite realistically, and not as figures of speech. And yet, it is implied, there is no *separation* between the Father and the Son. The spiritual space is an extension without separation; and the centre of that space is the Father's abode, a centre which from every other point, if such a description may be allowed, is perceived or felt as being 'the above', the ἄνω, ἐπάνω πάντων.

Whereas the preceding has thus strongly emphasized the *reality* (or substantiality) of the spiritual world, the last section of the discourse (Jn $3^{1—21}$) turns to the constitutive attributes of the spiritual world and the Divine Gift, contrasting it with the qualities and characteristics of the terrestrial world. The attributes of the spiritual world, the World of the Father, are expressed by the conceptions of *Love* and *Light*. The Divine Gift is a gift emanating from the Father out of his love for the world. Love is the essence of that gift itself. Thirdly, Love is the constitutive quality of the Eternal Life, conferred by the Divine Gift.

Some illustrations for comparison with vs. 3^{16} may be adduced here.

In Rabbinical Literature the nearest approach to the doctrine of God's love of the world as a whole is perhaps to be found in *GenR* 9_4, where, commenting upon the words of *Gen* 1^{31} 'and God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good', the two contemporary Palestinian 1st generation Amoras RR. Ḥ^{a}nina bar Ḥama[1] and R. Yōnāþān ben 'Ælʿāzār are reported as picturing God's concern for his world in similar words:

רחב"ח אמר משל למלך שבנה פלטין ראה אותה וערבה לו אמר פלטין הלואי
תהא מעלת חן לפני בכל עת כשם שהעלית חן לפני בשעה זו כך אמר הקב"ה
לעולמו עולמי עולמי הלואי תהא מעלת חן לפני בכל עת כשם שהעלית חן לפני
בשעה זו.

»R. H^{a}nina bar Ḥama said: It may be likened unto a king who built a palace; he looked at it, and it pleased him; he said: 'Palace! Palace! O that you might always obtain favour before me (= please me) as you obtain favour before me in this hour; so the Holy One, blessed be He, said to his world: O my world! my world! would that thou mayest always obtain favour before me as thou obtainest favour before me in this hour.» (R. Yōnāþān has the same dictum attached to another similitude.) The underlying idea is that the Holy One loves his newly created world, and wishes that it would remain in such a state, that it could always find favour in his sight. The implication is that with man's sin the whole world is defiled. Yet it always remains his world, the object of his concern. The world in such sayings as that quoted is the world as planned and created by the Holy One, and the attention is fixed on the human element in it: it is almost equivalent with 'the human world'. It should also be remembered that almost without exception, when the terms העולם, עולם, [ὁ κόσμος], alone, or עולמך, עולמי, עולמו[2], are used, the sense is the one just mentioned. The world is then pictured as God's possession, sinful and fallen, no doubt, like a way-ward child, yet not rejected or accounted essentially evil, nor viewed as the antithesis of the Holiness of God. It is the world of imperfection, of blindness, that will some time become perfect, the worthy abode of the Š^{e}kīnā. The relation of the Holy One to 'his world' is, as far as we know, never expressed by the term 'love' (אהבה,חבה). The following may be cited as characteristic expressions of this relationship:

---

[1] Some texts have 'R. Ḥama bar Ḥanina', *i.e.* the son of R. Ḥanina bar Ḥama.

[2] Cf. Schlatter, *SH 4 Ev.* p. 46: »... die Formel: seine (Gottes) Welt, עוֹלָמוֹ, wird bei den Palästinensern stabil».

GenR 12 15:

כך אמר הקב"ה אם בורא אני את העולם במדת הרחמים הוי חטייה סגיאין
במדת הדין היאך העולם יכול לעמוד אלא הרי אני בורא אותו במדת הדין ובמדת
הרחמים והלואי יעמוד.

»Thus said the Holy One: If I create the world in (by) the attribute of mercy [alone], their sins will be exceeding[ly great]; [if] by the attribute of justice [alone], how shall the world be able to subsist? No, behold, I will create it by the attribute of justice and by the attribute of mercy together, and I will that it may subsist», *i.e.* not become so corrupt that even God's mercy cannot save it from the destruction which his Justice must decree on it. The *Divine attitude toward the world is thus characterized as one of Mercy and will to see it saved.*[1]

God's attitude towards man quā man is expressed by the term of love in the wellknown dictum by R. ʿ^{A}qiḇa recorded in *Pirqē ʾĀḇōp̄* 3 21:

הוא היה אומר חביב אדם שנברא בצלם

»He (R. ʿ^{A}qiḇa) used to say, Beloved is man [by God], that he was created in [his] image.»

With this may be contrasted the frequent dicta relating to God's love for Israel or for the righteous, e.g. in the sequel to the dictum just quoted from *Pirqē ʾĀḇōp̄*. Cf. *Sifre*, 60 d *GenR* 32 2 (Israel says to the nations of the world: 'you have no part in him [God]', ref. to *Cant.* 6 3).

The inherent evil aspect of the 'world' is usually attached to the term [ה]עולם הזה (= ὁ κόσμος οὗτος), especially in contrast to עולם הבא, (the future world). To this term can be applied, with equal exactitude, the features that are maintained by Bauer[2] as specially characteristic for the Jn-ine conception of ὁ κόσμος (οὗτος). The Jn-ine ὁ κόσμος οὗτος is no doubt the literal translation of the Hebrew עולם הוה (Aramic: האי עלמא or עלמא דין).[1] Hence there is no greater difficulty in the seemingly contradictory conceptions of the world *e.g.* in Jn $3^{16,17}$ compared with 8^{23} or 12^{31}. The corresponding variant use of the term 'world' is found in the Rabbinic עולמו, God's created world, compared with עולם הוה viewed as the very antithesis to the Divine world.

---

[1] Cf. however, the benedictions in the liturgy referred to as *'ah^{a}ḇap̄ ʿōlām'* and *ʾ^{a}hāḇā rabbā* (I Elbogen, *Jüd. Gottesdienst*^{2} p. 20) *TB Ber* 11 b.

[2] *J. Ev.*^{2} p. 18: »Er (the κόσμος) erscheint als der Gegensatz zu Gott... als die Finsternis... ja das Gottfeindliche, die ganz und gar vom Satan beherrschte Sphäre. Er hat weder Verständnis für den Logos (substitute: 'God' or 'the Š^{e}ḵīnā'), noch Sympathie für seine Anhänger. Vielmehr hasst er alles, was nicht von seiner Art ist und wird deshalb ausdrücklich vom Kreise derer ausgeschlossen, für die Christus bittet. *Für die abschätzige Bewertung des Kos-*

The nearest parallels in Hermetic writings to the ideas of the Jn-ine passage under discussion are perhaps best summed up in the following references:

(I) *Corp Herm* I_{12} (acc. to Scott) ὁ δὲ πάντων πατὴρ νοῦς, ὁ ὢν ζωὴ καὶ φῶς, ἀπεκύησεν ἄνθρωπον αὐτῷ ὅμοιον. οὗ ἠγάσθη ὡς ἰδίου τόκου· περικαλλὴς γὰρ ἦν, τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς εἰκόνα ἔχων. εἰκότως ἄρα ὁ θεὸς ἠγάσθη τῆς ἰδίας μορφῆς· καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ δημιουργήματα »But Νοῦς the Father of all, he who is Life and Light, gave birth to a Man, a Being like to Himself. And He took delight in Man, as being His own offspring; for Man was very goodly to look on, bearing the likeness of his Father. With good reason then did God take delight in Man; for it was God's own form that God took delight in: And God delivered over to Man all things that had been made.» The reference is here to the First, Celestial Man. The passage is strikingly similar to ʿAqiba's dictum in *Pirqē ʾAḇōþ* quoted above. To show its bearing on the conceptions of Jn 3^{16} we must refer to the sequel of *Corp Herm I.* The Celestial Man descends into the physical world, the φύσις; from his 'marriage' with φύσις, *i.e.* his entrance into the physical world, seven terrestrial men are brought forth, *i.e.* as physical organisms, from whom, subsequently, the human terrestial beings are generated. Earthly man may, however, have something of the Celestial Νοῦς in him; to him the Divine message is delivered: »And let the man that has νοῦς in him recognize that he is immortal, and that the cause of death is carnal desire. And he who has recognized himself enters into

---

mos ist es bezeichnend, dass er „diese“ Welt heisst und so in Gegensatz zu einer anderen tritt», as if the Rabbinical term 'this world' in a technical sense had never existed! On references *vide* below on 9^{28}.

[1] ὁ κόσμος οὗτος is indeed a more literal translation than the synoptic ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος. It is to be noticed, that in עולם הוה the sense of κόσμος is present, as well as that of αἰών, and frequently the *emphasis* is on the former sense. ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων is = לעתיד לבא.

the Good.» (καὶ ἀναγνωρισάτω ὁ ἔννους ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν ὄντα ἀθάνατον, καὶ τὸν αἴτιον τοῦ θανάτου ἔρωτα ὄντα. ὁ δὲ ἀναγνωρίσας ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν χωρεῖ. *Corp Herm* I 18.) The question 'Why is it that he who has recognized himself enters into the Good?' is answered thus: 'It is because the Father of all consists of Light and Life and from him Man has sprung . . . If then, *being made of Life and Light, you learn to know that you are made of them, you will go back into Life and Light*'. (῞Οτι ἐκ φωτὸς καὶ ζωῆς συνέστηκεν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων, ἐξ οὗ γέγονεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐὰν οὖν ἐκ ζωῆς καὶ φωτὸς ὤν, μάθῃς ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐκ τούτων τυγχάνεις, εἰς ζωὴν καὶ φῶς πάλιν χωρήσεις. *Corp Herm* I 21.) The *Saviour,* coming from the Father, the Νοῦς, and also called Νοῦς, relates of his function thus: '*I, even Νοῦς, come to those men who are holy and good and pure and merciful;* and *my coming is a succour to them,* and forthwith they recognize all things, and win the Father's grace by loving worship, and give thanks to him, praising and hymning him with hearts uplifted to him in filial affection' (παραγίνομαι ἐγὼ ὁ νοῦς τοῖς ὁσίοις καὶ ἀγαθοῖς καὶ καθαροῖς καὶ ἐλεήμοσι, καὶ ἡ παρουσία μου γίνεται αὐτοῖς βοήθεια, καὶ εὐθὺς τὰ πάντα γνωρίζουσι, καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἱλάσκονται ἀγαπητικῶς, καὶ εὐχαριστοῦσιν εὐλογοῦντες καὶ ὑμνοῦντες, τεταγμένοι πρὸς αὐτὸν τῇ στοργῇ. *Corp. Herm.* I 22).

The conception of the supreme God as taking delight in the archetypal man is, of course, really identical with that of God as loving mankind, since the archetypal man includes in himself the whole human world; similarly I 22 implies a volition on the part of the Supreme God towards the salvation of the spiritual (noetical) in man; it is, however, apparent, that the idea of 'love' does not play any constitutive rôle. On the other hand, the prominence given to the conceptions of Life and Light, and also of truth, forms an actual parallel to Jn 3^{16-21}.

The most noteworthy parallel is, however, that referring to the relation between the full attainment of Life and Light, and the inception of spiritual existence in earthly life. This inception is caused by the entrance into the worthy of the succouring Νοῦς, the counterpart to a certain degree of the Celestial Power-Messenger in Mandæan mysticism. By this they are awakened to recognize (γνωρίζειν, ἀναγνωρίζειν) their celestial origin. The real entrance into Life and Light, the Spirit's ascent, does not take place, it would seem, until after the death of the physical body (I 24 ff.), yet it is begun already by the said recognition; a new life is attained which is viewed under the aspect of aspiration, of motion upwards, in which the attainment of 'Life and Light' is somehow inherent. Now, by the speaker in *Corp. Herm.* I 26 this stage is expressed by the words: διὸ πιστεύω καὶ μαρτυρῶ ὅτι εἰς ζωὴν καὶ φῶς χωρῶ. The πιστεύειν here follows, not on thinking, but on an inner experience: it is itself directed towards the Life and the Light; one might perhaps say that πιστεύειν itself is a motion towards the final goal, it is a spiritual force which makes itself felt as a realization of the Life and Light inherent in that experience, and as a confident aspiration towards a future complete possession of that same Life and Light. A similar connotation adheres to πιστεύειν in *Corp. Herm.* IV 4, quoted above p. 74, »believing that you shall ascend ...» In *Corp. Herm.* IX 10, again, πιστεύειν seems to refer to an intellectual process.

(2) God's relation to the κόσμος is variously described in the Hermetica. Acc. to *Corp. Herm.* VIII κόσμος is the second God (δεύτερος ϑεός); κόσμος »has been made, and is maintained in being, by the first God»; God is called the Father of the κόσμος, since »it has been made by God in his image» (κατ᾽ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ γενόμενος); man has been made in the image of the Kosmos, and feels himself to be a part of the κόσμος, but he also apprehends — by ἔννοια — the first God. »In his account of the relation between God and the Kosmos the writer is dependent on the *Timæus* of Plato.»[1] Special attention may be called to the passage acc. to which the Father, having generated the κόσμος, took delight in it.[2] Acc. to *Corp. Herm.* VI 2 b the »Kosmos is good, in that it makes all things», (being the »proximate maker of individual organisms», whereas »God is the supreme Maker of all things»[3]), »but in all other aspects the Kosmos is not good». Acc. to *Corp. Herm.* X 12, »the Kosmos is not-good, as being subject to movement; but it is not-evil, as being immortal», and *ib* 14: »There are these three then, — God, Kosmos, Man. The Kosmos is contained by God, and man is contained by the Kosmos. The Kosmos is son of God; man is son of the Kosmos, and grandson, so to speak, of God.» *Corp. Herm.* XII 15, again, enunciates: ὁ δὲ σύμπας κόσμος οὗτος, ὁ μέγας ϑεός, καὶ τοῦ μείζονος εἰκών, καὶ ἡνωμένος ἐκείνῳ, καὶ σώζων τὴν τάξιν κατὰ τὴν βούλησιν τοῦ

---

[1] W. Scott, *Hermetica* ii 189.

[2] W. Scott, *ib.* ii 37 f. Plato, *Timæus* 37 C. Wellknown is the passage in Philo, *De Ebr* 8 where ὅδε ὁ κόσμος is called ὁ μόνος καὶ ἀγαπητὸς αἰσθητὸς υἱός.

[3] W. Scott, *a. a. O.* pp. 175 f.

πατρός, πλήρωμά ἐστι τῆς ζωῆς, »This whole Kosmos — which is a great god, and an image of him who is greater, and is united with Him, and maintains its order in accordance with the Father's will, — is fulness of life», »There is not, and has never been, and never will be in the Kosmos anything that is dead. For it was the Father's will that the Kosmos, as long as it exist, should be a living being; and therefore it must needs be a god also.»

(3) The expression '*God loves*' is applied to τὸ καλόν and τὸ ἀγαθόν in the pronouncedly Platonic *Libellus* VI of *Corp. Herm.* (ὧν αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ἐρᾷ VI 4).

(4) *Love* (ἔρως) as a celestial principle occurs in *Corp. Herm.* XVIII 14 b: οὐκ ἔστιν οὖν ἐκεῖσε πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφορά, οὐκ ἔστι τὸ ἀλλοπρόσαλλον ἐκεῖσε, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἓν φρονοῦσι, μία δὲ πάντων πρόγνωσις, εἷς αὐτοῖς νοῦς (ὁ πατήρ), μία αἴσθησις δι᾽ αὐτῶν ἐργαζομένη· τὸ [γὰρ] εἰς ἀλλήλους φίλτρον ἔρως ὁ αὐτός, μίαν ἐργαζόμενος ἁρμονίαν τῶν πάντων. (Reitz.)

It may be suggested that the nearest parallels, within the Hermetic writings, to the thoughts contained in Jn 3^{16-21} are found in *Libellus* I, which we have here ventured to assume is the earliest part of *Corp. Herm.*[1]

The greater part of these parallels are closely related to Rabbinic conceptions quoted above. Only one important expression remains, which probably does not go back on Jewish teachings, viz. I 32, διὸ πιστεύω καὶ μαρτυρῶ. The connotation of πιστεύειν analysed above is evidently almost congruent with that of πιστεύειν in Jn $3^{15, 16, 18}$. Suggestive, again, is the iuxtaposition of μαρτυρεῖν, also an important term in Johannine language. Apart from μαρτυρεῖν used of the μαρτυρία of J, and of the Father's μαρτυρία on J, it is used in a technical sense of a testimony concerning the Divine power of J, emanating from a personal experience of that power. This technical sense can be recognized already in the testimony by the people in Jn $12^{17, 18}$: ἐμαρτύρει οὖν ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ὢν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ὅτε τὸν Λάζαρον ἐφώνησεν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος. The people's μαρτυρία is not a mere 'bearing record' (A. V.), but a testimony to the fact, that they had seen a σημεῖον, and through this σημεῖον recognized in J a God-sent man, a prophet, who possessed a Divine power. They had obtained an experience of the higher life inherent in J, even if that experience was a very superficial one. Similarly the Baptist's testimony refers to the Divine-spiritual οὐσία of J: as the Light (who has come into the world) 1 8, 9, as the one who ἔμπροσθεν μου γέγονεν ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν 1 15 on whom the Spirit descended 1 32, who is the son of God 1 34. The Baptist's testimony is thus characterized: μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ 5 33. The same significance attaches to the testimony which the disciples, acc. to 15 26, 27 will be able to give in conjunction with the testimony of the Spirit of truth. Exactly identical language is used by 1 Jn: *ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη*, καὶ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, ἥτις ἦν πρὸς τόν πατέρα καὶ *ἐφανερώθη* ἡμῖν (1 Jn 1 2) ἡμεῖς *τεθεάμεθα* καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ *ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱὸν σωτῆρα* τοῦ κόσμου (1 Jn 4 14). The μαρτυρία refers both to the Eternal Life sent from the Father, revealed to the believers, and to their experience of that Life as the Saviour. The inference is that although the μαρτυρία is based on what has been 'seen', only he who has seen and *believed* can give this testimony. Only he who has believed and experienced the higher, spiritual, divine, life of J has really 'seen' in such a way as to be able to testify. One may compare 1 Jn 5 10: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν αὐτῷ. Evidently the μαρτυρία of the speaker in *Corp. Herm.* I 32 is likewise technically connected with his newly obtained experience of the higher life.

---

[1] This Libellus is very closely related to Rabbinic conceptions, especially those of the Palestinian *Gen R.* The notions of the bisexual Ἄνθρωπος (Adam), the archetypal man, as a Celestial Being possessing Life and Light, the obscuring of the conception of the descent of the Spirit (mentioned I 14 in the form of the marriage of the Celestial Man with Nature, resembling the Jewish mystical interpretation of *Gen* 6^2 as referring to the entrance of the Celestial into mere physical beings), the stress being laid on the ascent (I 24 ff.) resemble the Rabbinic (and Philonic) speculations on the First Man, *ʾāḏām hā-rišōn.* Cf. the characterization of the doctrine of *Corp. I* given by Scott (*Hermetica* ii pp. 7, 8).

The identity of general connotation of πιστεύειν and μαρτυρεῖν in Jn and *Corp. Herm. I* at the same time serves to underline the constitutive difference. Whereas *Corp. Herm.* refers the πίστις and μαρτυρία to the experience of the Eternal Life *per se,* to Jn πιστεύειν and μαρτυρεῖν can only have one object: the Son of Man. Whatever experiences of the Divine and Celestial may be given a man, they can only be given in and by the Son of Man. 'In Him' (ἐν αὐτῷ) the believer has eternal Life. Of him the believer testifies that *he* is the Light and the Life. All Divine gifts that are sent down to the World, are sent down in Him. The words ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, stand forth as the central thought of 3 16. It is the thought that may be said to be repeated, expressly or covertly, in every Jn-ine sentence: the essentiality and all-comprehensiveness of the Son of Man.

When turning to the conceptions of the *Odes of Solomon* we meet with a similar duplicity in the use of the term 'world' or 'worlds', ܥܠܡܐ, ܥܠܡ̈ܐ, and in the representations of the relations between the Divine and the world as in Rabbinic and the Hermetic writings. This may be illustrated by the following quotations.

Od. Sol. XII[1]: »3 . . . Because the Mouth of the Lord is the true *Word* (ܡܠܬܐ), and the door of His *light;* 4. And the *Most High hath given Him to His Worlds.* (Worlds) which are the *interpreters of His own beauty.* . . . 6. Never (doth the Word) fall, but ever it standeth; His descent and His way are incomprehensible. 7. For as His Work is, so is His limit; For *He is the light* and the dawn of thought. 8. And *by Him the worlds spake one to the other:* and those that were silent acquired speech: 9. And *from Him came love* and concord . . . 10. And *they (the Worlds) were stimulated by the Word*, And they knew Him that made them, Because they came into concord . . . 12. *For the dwelling-place of the Word is man, and His truth is love.*»

The expression in vs. 3, »the Most High hath given Him to His worlds» compares very closely with the Jn-ine τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν. In that Divine Word the Divine Love is inherent and is brought into the worlds: »from Him came *love,* and concord» (cf. *Corp. Herm.* XVIII 14 b, above p. 120), which comes very near to saying that the motive of the gift of the word was God's love, especially when compared with the Jn-ine conception of the Divine Love as inherent in the son and in the believers (Jn 15 9, 10, 17 26). The worlds are the universe as God's creation (»the interpreters of his own beauty»), but the attention is really focused on man, the ideal man, as the »dwelling-place of the Word». To man as the representative of the world the Divine gift of the true Word has been sent down, and »His truth is love».

Od. Sol. X[2]: »1. The Lord hath directed my mouth by His *Word* (ܒܡܠܬܗ); and He hath opened my heart by His *Light.* 2. And He hath *caused to dwell in me His deathless life;* and gave me to speak the fruit of His peace; 3. To convert the souls of those who are *willing to come to Him;* and to lead captive a good captivity for freedom. 4. (Christ speaks:) I was strengthened and made mighty and *took the world captive;* And (the captivity) became to me for the praise of the Most High and of God my Father. 5. And the *Gentiles* were gathered together . . . 6. And the *traces of the light* were set upon their hearts; and they *walked in my life* and were *saved* . . .[1]

---

[1] Rendel Harris, *Odes and Psalms of Solomon,* ii pp. 272 f.

[2] *Ib.* ii pp. 203 f.

Here the world is clearly the »world of man». It is used to express the universality of the Divine intention with regard to the human world. Those who accept the Divine gift receive Life and Light and *are saved.* *Od. Sol.* XII and X together reveal a close proximity in diction and conception to Jn 3 16–21.

Od. Sol. XIX[2]: »4. And the Holy Spirit opened His bosom, and mingled the milk of the two breasts of the Father, 5. And *gave the mixture to the world* without their knowing: And *those who take (it) are in the fulness of the right hand* (of the Father).

Here likewise the 'world' is used to express the universal object of the Divine Gift. The 'world' refers to the totality of human beings.

Od. Sol. VII[3]: »11. For He (the 'Father of Knowledge') it is that is incorrupt; the *perfection of the worlds* and *the Father of them*». *Od. Sol.* XVI[4]: »19. And the Worlds were made by His *Word,* and by the thought of His heart». The Father is the Father of the Worlds in their ideal aspect, when viewed as His creation.

Od. Sol. XX[5]: »3. For His thought is not *like* (the thought of) the *world*, Nor (like the thought of) *the flesh;* Nor like them that serve carnally». *Od. Sol.* XXII[6]: »11. Thy way was without corruption and thy face; thou didst bring *thy world to corruption;* that everything might be *dissolved and renewed*». This strikes another note. Here the worlds are viewed in their aspect of the abode of corruption, of the flesh, *i.e.* humanity as separated from the Divine Light. God's relation to the world of corruption is expressed by his will to destroy the corruption and renew the world and restore it into its ideal state.

In Mandæan literature the lower world, the κόσμος, as an antithesis to the House of Life and the Worlds of Light is as a rule viewed under the aspect of Evil. The entirety of the lower world, comprising several worlds (*GR V*[1]) or domains of evil, is termed *'the Place of Darkness'*[2], *'that region, the place of Darkness . . . in which there is no ray of Light'*.[3] But even with explicit reference to the world of earthly men — *'alma* or *tibil'* — such expressions are used as: *'the world of Darkness, the mughouse of Death'*[4], 'the Naṣoræans, who are left behind in the world of Darkness and in the Black Water'[5], 'behold, the earth is black water!'[6]. This world is under the dominion and is the possession of, the Evil Ones: 'the world of the Evil Ones'[7] 'I brought Adam out from the World of the Evil Ones'[8]; 'the abode, that is the abode of the Evil Ones, the place that consists wholly of sinners, the world of Darkness, of Envy and Discord, the world in which the Planets abide'[9], 'the world of impediments (תיקילאתא), full of delusion, deceit and fraud (ביהרארא, זיפא וכארבא)'[10], 'the world of Falsehood'[11]. ,The whole world is something that is nothing (worthless), and (a thing of) trust there is not in it (nothing in which to put ones trust, no security)'[12]. The Great Life addresses the world on account of it sins: »O, thou foolish world! . . . O, thou world, thou wild beast, that dost not know ,from left to right'.»[13] Tibil, in common with the mortal body, is called 'the house ready to fall’[1], ’the worthless abode’[2]. The Evil Ones call the world: ’this our own world’[3]. With this might be compared the frequent references to the ’King of Darkness’, the ’Prince of this world’[4].

---

[1] Rendel Harris, *O and Ps of Sol.*, ii pp. 203 f.

[2] *Ib.* ii pp. 298 f.

[3] *Ib.* ii p. 241.

[4] *Ib.* ii p. 284.

[5] *Ib.* ii p. 312.

[6] *Ib.* ii p. 326.

---

[1] Quoted above on 3^{13}.

[2] *GR* 70^{31} (*Pet* 74^{a}) אתאר השוך

[3] *GR* $72^{7,8}$ (*Pet* $75^{6,7}$): האך דוכתא אתרא ד̄השוכא . . . ד̄עוצבא ד̄נהורא ליתבה̄

[4] *GR* $183^{27,28}$ (*Pet* $180^{5,6}$): אלמא ד̄השוכא מאריבא דמותא

[5] *GR* $238^{7,8}$ (*Pet* $237^{9,10}$):

נאצוראייא ד̄שביקיא באלמא ד̄השוכא ומיא סיאויא

[6] *GR* 265^{28} (*Pet* $268^{5,6}$): הא ארקא מיא סיאויא

[7] *GR* 263^{31} (*Pet* 264^{10}); אלמא האילין ד̄בישיא

[8] *GL III* 530^{16} (*Pet* 92^{8}): מן אלמא ד̄בישיא אפיקתה̄ לאדאם

[9] *GL III* 511^{12-16} (*Pet* 78^{20-22}):

דאורא ד̄דור בישיא אתרא ד̄כולה̄ האטיא אלמא ד̄השוכא ד̄סינא קינא · ופלוגיא
דאורא הדאיריא שיביאהיא

[10] *GL III* 510^{1-6} (*Pet* $77^{19,20}$), cf. *MLi Qolasta* 161^{9}.

[11] *MLi Qolasta* $143^{8,9}$: אלמא ד̄שיקרא

[12] *GL III* 550^{12-15} (*Pet* $106^{23,24}$, 107^{1}):

אלמא כולה̄ מינדאם ד̄לאו מינדאם . . . ורוהצאנא ליתבה̄

[13] *GL III* 585^{1}, $585^{11,12}$ (*Pet* 129^{21}, 130^{7}):

יא אלמא סאכלא . . . יא אלמא היוא באלא ד̄מן סמיל ליאמין לאעדא
probably = dost not even know that which is between thy left and thy right [hand].

The relation between the World(s) of Light and this world is, however, not viewed exclusively under the aspect of antithesis, or eternal contrast. It is also expressed in terms of the relative *power* of the two realities. Thus, to quote *GR III* 75^{23}—76^{19} (*Pet* 77^{18}—78^{5}):

מיא מן השוכא מקאשאשיא... עותריא מן השוכא מקאשאשיא
עותריא מקאשאשיא מן השוכא וקאשישיא מן דאיאריא דבה
קאשישא טאבותא מן בישיתא דאתאר השוך קאשישא עשאתא
האיתא מן עשאתא עכילתא דאתאר השוך קאשישא תושביהתא [78]
מן הארשיא ופודריא דבנא דבישא (ד)אבדיא קאשישא יארדנא
תליתאיא מן מיא אכליא דאתאר השוך קאשישא סיברותא מן
דא ודא דבישיא אבדיא דאתאר השוך קאלא דעותריא קאשיש מן
בישיא רורביא דאתאר השוך

»The Water is earlier than the Darkness . . . the Uthras are earlier than the Darkness, the Uthras are earlier than the Darkness and older than the inhabitants in it; the good(ness) is older than the evil of the place of darkness; the living fire is older than the consuming fire of the place of darkness, the praise is older than the magic and sorceries that the evil ones are doing, the third Jordan is older than the consuming water of the place of darkness, the wisdom is older than whatever the evil ones of the place of darkness are doing, the voice of the Uthras is older than the Mighty Evil Ones of the place of Darkness.» This impressive picture needs no comment. [Cf. above p. 57.]

---

[1] *GL III* 534^{20} (*Pet* 95^{18}): באיתא נאפלא, *lit:* ’the falling house’, cf *GL III* 585^{10} (*Pet* 130^{42}): אלמא דנפיל לאניקום: ’the world that falls (and) does not rise (again)’.

[2] *GL III* 535^{34} (*Pet* 96^{15}): דאורא באטלא

[3] *GR XI* $263^{23, 24}$ (*Pet* $265^{8, 9}$):

הינון להדאריא אמריא באלמא דנאפשאן קאלא דהייא לאניקרון דניהויא דילן
»They (the Evil Ones) speak to each other: ’In our own world they shall not voice the call of the Life, for it shall be our possession’». Cf. *GR XI* 267^{6} (*Pet* $269^{15, 16}$): ’the angels (demons) of this world’ אמלאכע דאלמא האזין

[4] For references *vide* below on Jn 12^{31}.

The Celestial World and the 'Life' is mightier than the Lower World. When the Life enters into relation with this world, it is victorious. This entrance into relation with the lower world is done through a Son or Messenger who carries the Life, or the Mana, within him; and in as far as he does carry the Life within him, he dominates the powers of this world, and cannot be overcome by them. The 'Prince of the whole world' says to Namrus, 'the mother of this world': »The man (*i.e.* the Messenger, Manda dHayye) is greater than all the world; I beheld the image of his face, and I did not rise to the whole height of his stature; I did not rise to the whole height of his stature, for he is greater than all the worlds»[1] (*i.e.* I was no match for him.) This idea is also expressed by frequent representations of the Messenger as the 'Strange Man', who eludes all the plottings of the Evil Ones. They cannot get at him. From this point of view »the lower world is represented as destined to perish»[2] and the object of the Messenger's work in regard to the believers is to take them away from this world, to make them 'strangers' to the world of Darkness.[3] The Spirit ascending after death to its original abode is enjoined: »Bless thy ancestral home and curse this place!»[1]

---

[1] *GR III* $86^{24,25}$ (*Pet* 85^{11-16}):

מארא דכולה אלמא מאליל דנימארלה לנאמרוס עמא דהאזין אלמא גאברא
דהאזין אבאדליא נפיש מן כילה אלמא דמותא דאנפה הזית ועל כולה קומתה
לאקאמית לאקאמית על כולה קומתה אמינטול דנפיש מן כולהון אלמיא

Cf. *GR III* 82^{5-12} (*Pet* 82^{2-5}):

רוהא לברה תימאר ותאודא למליך השובא עבא דראב מינאך והאילה מיאתאר
מן כולהון אלמאך עבא אלמא דנפיש מן דילאך דרורביא בגאואיהון יאתביא

»Ruha speaks to her son, and teaches the King of Darkness: 'There is one who is greater than thou, and whose power surpasses all thy worlds. There is a world that is greater than thine, and mighty ones are housed in it'.»

[2] *GR II* $62^{9,10}$ (*Pet* 67^{17-19}):

האימינובה במאראיכון מאלכא ראמא דנהורא אמינטול דאלמא האזין שאלים
ובאטיל

»Believe in your Lord, the Great King of Light, for this world terminates and perishes.»

GR III $78^{6,7}$ (*Pet* 79^{10}):

כולהין עבידאתה באטלא באטליא בני השובא

»All the work(s) of the darkness perish, perish do the children of darkness.»

[3] *GR X* 241^{30-32} (*Pet* $240^{11,12}$):

דניקרון קאלא דהייא דשאנאי מינה מן אלמא ונינאברון נאפשאיהון מן אלמא
דהשובא

»(Manda dHayye speaks: 'The Life procured for me tribes from the tribe of the Life,) that they might voice the call of Life, that is more wonderful than the world, and that they may estrange themselves from the World of Darkness'.»

Since, however, the Messenger from the Life comes to this world to bring Life and Light to the incarnated spirits dwelling in it, the relation between »the Life» and the World can be represented in a different manner, without any real contradiction. *The Beloved Son* comes to the world from the abode of Light, and through him, Love (or Goodness, *ṭabuta*) enters this world. (*Vide* the quotation from *GR III* 91^{11-18} given above p. 77).[2] The love or goodness is connected with the rise of the world of human beings. The 'three Uthras' (cf. above p. 83 l. 1), the helpers of the Beloved Son, come and guard the spirit, cause the voice of Life to be heard, and *enlighten the House ready to fall* (*i.e.* this world). The Uthras bring *Water*, and create a Jordan in the world, and spread out splendour over it. (*GR III* 92, *Pet* 89). The first-born son puts all worlds in order (cf. quotation from *GR V* 165, *Pet* 155, above p. 81 l. 20 f.). Hence it can be said that the *world* was awakened'[3], with reference to the human world, or to the spirits of the tribe of the Celestial Adam. In a similar nexus of thought Adam himself is referred to as a beloved Son *(Bra rahima)*, and as the *King of this World*[4], although then also the Good that has entered the World eludes the Evil rulers: »the Masters of the House do not know that this world has a Master».[5] It remains, that 'this world' may be used in a good sense, as the world in which good has entered, essentially in the sense of the ideal human world. To this human world in the World of Darkness the »Life» stands in a relation that might be expressed as 'Friendship' and 'Mercy', actually even

---

[1] *GL III* 511^{33-35} (*Pet* 79^{3}):

בורכה̄ לבית אנאשאך ולוטה̄ להאזין אתרא

[2] Cf. *GR III* 114^{17-19} (*Pet* 105^{9-11}):

כוי עתהאשאב בישיא בבישותון אנא עתהאשבית על טאבתא ד̄עבאד טאבותא באלמא

»When the Evil Ones planned (evil things) in their evilness, I planned a good thing, that I might perform goodness in the world.»

[3] *GR XI* 261^{5} (*Pet* 262^{6}): עתיאיאר אלמא

[4] *GR III* $107^{13, 14, 31, 32}$ (*Pet* $100^{8, 9, 23, 24}$):

עתית ד̄ענצאב ברא רהימא... אדאם בראי דיליא הו מאלכא ד̄האזין אלמא

[5] *GR III* $106^{8, 9}$ (*Pet* 99^{6}):

לאיאדיא מארא ד̄באיתא ד̄עתלה̄ מארא להאזין אלמא

as 'Love'. From the human world of believers, again, Love is tended towards the Life.

GR V 2 182^{3-10} (*Pet* 178^{15-20}):

אנין עׄל הייא עתירהיצנין ועׄל הייא הואלאן רוהצאנא וכושטא
הואלאן בילואיתאן ועתראוריביא בראבות מאנדאך וקאם הייא
לראהמאיכון בראהמותא דכושטא וזידקא כוישיריאנא רבא דארקא
דאיאר אלבישתינכין יכאסאיתינכין זידקא בראהמותא דרהימיתון
למאנדא דהייא תריץ ברישאיכון זאכאתא

»We trusted in the Life and in the Life we put trust and Kušṭa was with us. And we waxed great in the Greatness of thy knowledge. And *the Life arose to love you* (or: have mercy upon you). Because of the Love of Kušṭa (Truth) and Righteousness, I clad you and covered you with righteousness as with a great coat of mail from the earth of ether. Because of the Love, with which you loved Manda dHayye, victory is put upon your head.»

GR XII $271^{20,21}$ (*Pet* 274^{10}):

אתא בטאב כושטא נהורא דמאסגיא לבית ראחמה

»Come with goodness, Kušṭa, o Light that descendest to the *house* of its *friends.*»

There is a mutual relation of Love between the Life and the believers dwelling in this world. The believers form the good world κατ' ἐξοχήν in the lower world.

For typical examples relating to the entrance of Good into the Lower world one may refer to the passages quoted above, pp. 57 (*MLi* 187, *GR* 15, 33, 103, 266) and 87 (*GR* 241), »In the fragrance of the Water of Life the *whole world may exult (shine)*». The 'Water of Chaos', representing the lower world as the world of Darkness and Evil, is *transformed* by the Water of Life. The Good thus existing in and forming an element of, the world, is seen mainly as the spiritual essence inherent in the human world; but of this spiritual element even the world itself, as the abode of the human beings, partakes to a certain degree (*GR* 176, p. 82, l. 20 above, *GR* 103, p. 57 above). This idea is, however, always accompanied by the strongly emphasized notion that the Good, the element of Life, of Mana, which has thus entered the World, does not really belong there. Hence the scintillation between two opposite views on the demiurg: sometimes regarded as good and 'holy', sometimes as 'evil'[1], or fallen. Hence also the relation of Life to the world as containing elements of the spiritual may be represented as one of Love, but only in the sense of a will to save the human beings from the Darkness and to cause them to return to the world of Life and Light.

From the parallels in Jewish, Hermetic and Mandæan language and in the *Od. Sol.* adduced above it is evident that Jn is merely adopting the language of the times in his use of the word 'κόσμος'. Hence there is in the Jn-ine use of the word no indication of the meeting of two incompatible lines of thought as peculiar to Jn. He simply adopts, and finds appropriate, the duplicity in the current use of the word.

Further it is noticeable that the Jn-ine use of the word best corresponds to the Jewish one. Apart from the technical term בא העולם (Jn 1^{9}, ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον) κόσμος is used with reference to the created world, the 'totality of creation' (Jn 1^{10}, 6^{14}, 13^{1}, 17^{5} cf. above p. 115 f., 123) to the human world (Jn 1^{29}, 3^{17}, 4^{42}, $12^{19,47}$, 14^{19}, $17^{6,10}$), especially in the sense of receiver of the Divine gifts (3^{16}, 4^{42}, $6^{33,51}$) although these are accepted only by some, the believers (1^{10}, 3^{19}) — this is also attested in *Corp. Herm.*, *Od. Sol.* and *Mand.* — but also with reference to the world as the domain of evil and darkness, especially, — and this is an originally Jewish usage — in the expression '*this* world', ὁ κόσμος οὗτος עולם הזה, (cf. above p. 116 f.). With the current Jewish notions on the relation of the Holy One to the world Jn, however, joins issue, in so far as they were apt to emphasize Gods' love for *Israel*, as the children of Abraham[2], or as the accepters of the Tora of Moses, with the double meaning of the Law and the Scripture.[3] Against this Jewish restriction Jn emphasizes that God's Love, the Divine Gift and the Salvation have for their object the whole human world: Jn 1^{29}, $3^{16, 17, 19}$, 4^{42}, $6^{33, 51}$. The universality of the Divine Love, therefore, is one specific point of the teaching.

---

[1] This applies to all the celestial figures represented as demiurgs: *Yošamin, Abatur* (*vide* Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer* pp. xxvii ff.), the 'second' and 'third Life', *Ptahil* (sometimes represented as the son of Abatur, as the 'fourth Life': Lidzbarski, *Ginza,* p. 601, *sub voce*). The underlying thought is that, although 'this world has been made to shine through the demiurg', the work of the demiurg in bringing down the Celestial into the region of Darkness is itself a crime. It means the rise of a strife (cf. *M Joh* 9) between the Good and the Evil; the human beings, carriers of the Mana, are led astray into love of the darkness, they 'drink the Water of Chaos', become like the Beings of Darkness, themselves children of Darkness (cf. above p. 57).

[2] Jn $8^{39\,\text{ff.}}$, cf. pp. 116, 139.

[3] Jn $5^{45\,\text{f.}}$, 6^{52}, 7^{22}, $9^{28,29}$, cf. *Sifre, u̯ᵉzop̄ ha-l·lᵉrāk̄ā*, 60 c, d^{1}.

A second specific point is that expressed by the words ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ *ἔδωκεν*. As has already been maintained, these words are intended to stress the truth, that the Son is God's gift to the world, and, moreover, is *the* gift. There are no Divine gifts apart from or outside the one-born son. Just as everything is given to him by the Father (Jn 13^{3}), so no gift from above can be given to men except by the son. Cf. $6^{32, 33, 35}$: ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, *οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληϑινόν, ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ ϑεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ . . . *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς.* Just as the teaching 'there is no ascent to heaven apart from the Son of Man' is stressed in intentional contrast to (Jewish) notions of the possibility of ascent into heaven, so this evidently implies an issue with Jewish reliance on certain Divine gifts obtained by Israel. Against this Jn wants to convey that all Divine gifts in the past were really given by the Father through the son, and should have as their object the directing of the hearts of the receivers (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων) towards the *one* perfect and true gift, the Son.

The third specific point is that of the concluding words of 3^{16}: μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. The antithesis of perdition and eternal life introduced here dominates the whole of the following part of the section, $3^{17—21}$. Corresponding to the antithesis in the preceding portion between two worlds and two existences, the part that follows exhibits the contrast between the attributes or qualities of and the laws obtaining in, those two worlds and the existence in them. This contrast is expressed in the terms of eternal life — salvation — light — truth — works performed in God, on one side, and on the other: perdition — judgement — darkness — evil deeds — estrangement from God — hatred of the Light.

Some parallels to the ideas of this section may be adduced.

GR V 2 $182^{27—32}$ (*Pet* $179^{8—13}$)

הוא קאלא בכול ארקא אראב זיוא בכול מדינתא ואתגליא מאנדא דהייא לכולהון
בנאת אנאשא ומפאריקלון מן השוכא לנהורא ומן האבארא לנהור הייא פוק
מינה מן דבאר צאדיא ואטאר ואדון נאפשאיכון מן זיפא והרארא דהאזין אלמא

»The call was [voiced] on all the earth, the splendour arose in every city, and Manda dHayye is revealed to all the children of man and separates (saves) them from Darkness into Light, from obscurity into the light of Life: 'Go out from the empty desert and estrange yourselves and keep away from the falsehood and delusion of this world'.» Cf. *GR III* $506^{27}-507^{60}$.

GR XV $296^{27, 28}$ (*Pet* 299^{23-24})

אפרישינין לנישמאתא דלאנימיתא ולא ניודא ולאניסתאברא בהשובא האשבא

[The Life speaks to the Messenger Anoš:] »Teach the spirits that they may not die nor perish nor be confined in the gloomy darkness!» Cf. *GR IV* $147^{35}-148^{5}$ quoted above p. 78.

GR II 3 60^{16-25} (*Pet* 66^{4-9})

מן יומא דהזאינאך ומן יומא דשותאך שמאנין מן יומא דהזאינאך ליבאן ניאחא
עתמליא האימאנובאך טאבא הזאינא לנהוראך ולאנינישיאך לאנינישיאך כולהון
יומאן ושיתא הדא מן ליבאן לאנישיבקאך אמינטול דליבאן לאנעואר והאלין
נישמאתא לאניבתאבראן

[Those awakened by the voice of the Messenger speak:] »From the day that we beheld thee, and from the day that we heard thy words, from the day that we beheld thee, our heart was filled with Peace. They *(l: we) believed in thee, O Good one,* we beheld thy Light and we shall not forget thee; we shall not forget thee all our days and we shall not let thee out from our heart for one hour; for our heart shall not be blinded and these [our] spirits shall not be confined [kept back in, shut in by the Darkness].»

Cf. the frequent saying: »the children of Darkness perish but the children of the mighty Life shall abide» (*e. g. GR* 77, 78 quoted above, p. 57 l. 2, 3).

GR V 2 180^{5-15} (*Pet* 175^{24} 176^{1-9})

קאל הייא מן פיריא ומאל זאדיקיא מן נהורא קאלאיהון דבהיריא זידקא מן
שבינאתא תיתאיאתא דבשומא דהייא משאבין ואמריא אנין מותא עדאנין בתיביל
מן יומא דהייא רהימנין ומותא סנאינין עלאואיכון דילכון הייא עתירהיצנין ועל
שומאיכון הייא בתיביל עתראדאפנין דהול ושאבא בהיריא זידקא להייא והייא
עלאואיכון שביניא ואנאתון בהיריא זידקא ניהיא תריציתון בתריצותא קום קודאמאי
נהאר ואנהאר נהוראי ריליא עלאואיכון נידניא

»The voice of the Life from the Fruits[1] and the Word of the righteous from the Light; the voices of the *Bhirē Zidqā*[2] from the lower Škinas, who praise the name of the Life saying: 'We knew the Death in Tibil. From the day that *we loved the Life and hated the Death,* we *put our trust on thee, o Life,* and on account of thy Name, o Life, we were persecuted in Tibil! Fear the Life and praise the Life, O Bhirē Zidqā, and the Life will dwell[1] on you, and you, O Bhirē Zidqā will be established (erected, lifted up); stand erect before me! Shine and cause to shine! My own Light shall ascend on you.»

---

[1] *Pire,* plural of Pira; on the conception *vide* Brandt, *Mandäische Religion* § 12 and *Mandäische Schriften*, pp. 125 f.

[2] »The men of tested righteousness», a technical term for the believers, confer the Jewish 'anše hā-'ᵊmunā' and 'benē mᵉhæmnūþā'. Cf. Odeberg, *3 En,* ii p. 179.

Cf. the passages on the separation of Life from Death, Light from Darkness, Good from Evil, Truth from Falsehood, worked by the Judge of all Spirits, quoted by R. Bultmann and W. Bauer[2] (*MLi* 128, *GR II* 56); cf. also the similar saying in *GR VI* 206 $^{22-27}$ (*Pet* 205 $^{8-12}$).

Other passages illustrating the connexion of the belief in the Life or more especially, in the Messenger, with the attainment of Life are:

GR XI 253 $^{20-32}$ (*Pet* 252 $^{5-17}$)

מאנדא דהייא האיזן אמארלון לאלמיא כולהון דניהון ואמאר כול נישמאתא
דהאתאם רמיבה ביהשוכא ומותא האנאתה לואתאיכון יומא באתראיא אלמא
תיהזון לרואהא דנישמאתא דבהיריא זידקא דשומא קאלא דהייא דקראלהון
והאימנובה ועתקאיאמבה במאנדא דהייא והאימין בשותא דגובריא תלאתא ...
(252 ^{13}) דאשבא ואנאתון ניהויא ו(מית)קאימיתון כוי בהיריא זידקא זיוא לבישיא
ונהורא מבאסין ואדין עלאואיכון וכאלקיא לאתרא רבא דנהורא ואנאתון האיזיתון
כוי שביניתון בהשוכא דאלמא האזין ועל נאפשאיכון תיתראהמיתון

»[5]–Manda dHayye spoke to all the beings[3] who shall be[4] and he said–[5]: 'O, all you Spirits, who are thrown thither into darkness and death: when that *last day* shall be with you, why will you behold the comfort of the spirits of the *Bhirē Zidqā*[6] who listened to the voice of the Life, that he made heard to them, and who *believed in*, and became established in *Manda dHayye*, and who believed in the words of the three men[7] . . . for you will have to stand [apart, below] when the Bhirē Zidqā clad in splendour and covered with light pass by you and ascend to the great place of Light and you shall behold this when dwelling in the darkness of this world and you shall pity yourselves.» — In the sequel the non-believers are pictured as thrown into the evil Darkness, where their eyes do not see the light, daily undergoing *punishment*, trial and judgement. And it is said: »Every Naṣoræan who forsakes the way of Life and walks in the way of Darkness, shall fare likewise»[1].

---

[1] שביניא.

[2] R. Bultmann, *D. Bedeut. der neuerschl. mand. u. manich. Quellen etc.* (*ZNTW* xxiv) p. 111, W. Bauer, *JEv*² p. 56.

[3] lit. 'worlds'.

[4] *i.e.* who are to be born into this world.

[5–5] This is probably a later insertion.

[6] *i.e.* why should you live in such a way as to be excluded at the last day from the comfort of the righteous.

[7] *i.e.* Hibil, Šitil and Anoš, cf. above p. 82.

GR XI 255^{22}—256^{7} (*Pet* 254^{23}—255^{22})

תום יומא האנאתה דסאיפא עשומיא וארקא דהויא ארקא ושומיא באתאיכון
דשיביאהיא [255] סאגיבון נאפליא כולהון . . . [255^{5}] ואבאתאר מותא אזליתון
בהשוכא נאפליתון ואנא קריתילכון על הייא דשומא דמותא ליתבהון קריתילון
על נהורא דהשוכא ליתבה קריתילכון דאנאתון לביש זיוא ועתבאסון נהורא ופוק
בעוהרא דהייא ועיאפקינכון בשבילא דשומא דמותא ליתבה ושומא דהשוכא
ליתבה ואנאתון לעלאי דילאי לאשמאתונאן ושותא דעותריא לאביסמאת עלאואיכון
ואף בניא אנאשא דמן שורבא דאדאם והאוא דפאגראיהון דקאלא דהייא שומא
והאימינבה ועתאפראשבה ושומא קאלא דגובריא עלין תלאתא ושארהיבבה
בשותאיהון סנון מותא והייא רהים כנון השוכא ונהורא רהים לבאשיון זיוא
ועתבאסין נהורא סאלקיא בעוהרא ראבתיא דהייא ואתון ואשבינון הייא אף הינון
קרון קאלא דהייא בעודנאיכון ואנאתין לאשמאהון . . . [255^{21}] האשתא עוהרא
דאנאתון רהימתונה אתיתובה לואת אלאהאכון דאשיטינכון

»Further, on the day, when heaven and earth take an end, — which heaven and earth were your houses, in which the planets run their course: they all shall fall[2]. . . and after [your] death you shall go forth and fall into the Darkness. Yet I called you to *the Life*, in which the name of death is not, I called you to *the*

---

[1] *GR XI* 254$^{24-27}$ (*Pet* 253$^{19-21}$)

כול נאצוראיא . . . דעוהרא דהייא שאביק ובעוהרא דהשוכא אזליא ואף הינון
האיזין האוילון

[2] The passage is in reality directed against the Christian teaching. »Ruha and Christ say: 'I will make you ascend to Paradise. When you leave your body, you shall go there and find Grace'.» (*GR* 255$^{12-14}$.) But »Rūha and *Mšiha* (the Christian Messiah) and the Sun and the Moon and the Planets all take an end. Also the children of man who confessed Ruha, Mšiha and the God shall take an end together with Ruha.» Mšiha's promises to his believers of a spiritual, eternal Life will after their death be found out to have been a fraud. The import is: Mšiha was not a genuine Messenger from the Life.

Light, in which *Darkness* is not, I called you [saying]: 'Clothe yourselves in splendour and cover yourselves in light and go out on the way of the *Life*'. And I will cause you to go out (= lead you) on the path on which the name of Death is not, and the name of Darkness is not!' But you did not listen to me, and the words of the Uthras did not please you. Also the children of man, of the tribe of the corporeal[1] Adam and Hauua, who listened to the voice of the Life and *believed* in it and were taught by it, and heard the voice of these three men[2] and divulged (in) their words, who *hated the Death* and *loved the Life*, who *hated the Darkness* and *loved the Light*, clad themselves in splendour and covered themselves with light, *ascended* on the great way of the Life and came and *found the Life* — they also made the voice of the Life to be heard in your ears but you did not listen . . . now, on the way that you loved, you arrive to your gods who led you astray.»

M Joh XIII 57 (*T* 52 4—53 5)

נצביא לאשגאנדא ועל רדא דדאריא שאדויא קראבה בבאלווא בגאוה דמארגוש
אלמיא על קאלא דשגאנדא אדאם דשאכיב עתאר אדאם עתאר דשכיב אלאנפה
דשגאנדא נפאק . . . כולהון לטאב עדיכרוך ולדיליא ניצבון ושאדרון עלאך עתית
עיאפרישאך אדאם דעפארקאך מינה דהאזין אלמא צות ושומא [53] ועתאפראש
ובאק בואבותא לאתאר נהור אדאם שומא ועתהאימאן טובה למאן דשומא
והאימאן מן אבאתראך אדאם נסיב כושטא טובה למאן דנסיב כושטא מן
אבאתראך אדאם סבא וסליק טובה למאן דניסאק מן אבאתראך

»They created the Messenger and sent him to the Head of the Generations i.e. Adam. He called with a heavenly voice[3] into the turbulence of the words. At the voice of the Messenger, Adam who lay (in sleep[4]) *awoke*. Adam who lay in sleep awoke, and went out to meet the Messenger. [Adam welcomes the Messenger, as having come from his Fathers house. The Messenger speaks to Adam:] 'All remembered thee for good and procured me and sent me to thee. I have come, I will teach thee, O Adam, and *deliver thee from this world*. Listen and hear and take teaching and ascend victorious to the Place of Light!' Adam heard and became *believing;* — blessed is he who *believes* after thee! — Adam took possession of Kušṭa *(truth);* blessed is he who, after thee, takes possession of Kušṭa! — Adam *looked on high with hope*[1] *and ascended;* happy is he, who ascends after thee.»

---

[1] *v.* Nöldeke, *Mand. Gram.*, p. 316.

[2] cf. above, p. 132, n. 7.

[3] thus Lidzbarski (»mit himmlischer Stimme»).

[4] cf. above, p. 36.

GR XI 256 24 ff. (*Pet* 256 12 ff.). The Original, First One who originated from himself *(qadimē qadmāyā dmineh hụā)* instructs his *beloved Son* and the three Uthras to *acquit from judgement* the spirits dwelling in the World of Darkness, who listen to the words of the Life and are established through Manda dHayye. Hibil, the eldest brother, is given the function of being the »judge over the judges of this world». This forms a parallel to Jn 3 18: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται.

GR XI 257 14—20 (*Pet* 257 16—22)

כול נישמאתא דהאימאנובהון בהיריא זידקא ניתקאימון לואתאיכון בהא שכינתא
האזא ראבתיא דהייא וענדרונא דשאוילכון דהייא רביא ני(ת)קאימינכון מאנדא
דהייא בה בשכינתא האזא נאסקינכון לבית הייא אף כול נישמאתא דגדיל
ביסרא וזמא דקאלא דהייא שאמין והאימין לאנפא ניהוילוך לבית הייא

»All the spirits who *believed in (the Life)* shall be established with you[2] as Bhire Zidqā, in this great Škina of the Life and in the room of the Great Life, which I have arranged for you. Manda dHayye will establish you in this Škina and make you ascend to the House of Life. Also all spirits of [those] formed out of (*or:* as) flesh and blood, who listen to the voice of the Life and *believe,* shall dwell before the Presence, in the House of Life.»

The idea of escape from judgement for 'those who believe', is also attested in other contexts.

GR II 3 60 26—41 (*Pet* 66 9—16)

מאללית דעמארלון כול מאן דתאייב על נאפשה נישמה גזירא ליבא ולאית
דמארא אגזאר עלה הינעלא בישיא הינון כאדאביא מאגזיריא על נאפשאיהון
דמהאוילון ולאהאזין וקארילון ולאשאמין ולאמהאימניא בישיא בצוביאנון נאפליא
ביאמא רבא דסוף מישתיבניא בחשובא ובאלאלון טורא האשבא אלמא ליומא
יום דינא ואלמא לשיתא שאייא דפירקאנא אניך דמשאבינין מאראן האטאיאן
והאובאן תישבוקלאן

---

[1] סבא combines the sense of 'gaze, look' with that of 'hope'. What is meant here is really the בונה, mentioned above pp. 108 and 110.

[2] referring to the three Uthras.

»I spoke and said to them: 'Everyone who returns (to the Life), on his spirit *there shall be no decree (of judgement)* nor shall it be that the Lord shall decree (punishment) on him; but the *wicked,* they, the liars, they decree on [= bring judgement upon, *condemn*] *themselves;* for one shows them and they do not see, and one calls unto them, and they do not listen nor do they believe; *the wicked fall through their [own] will* into the great sea of the Suf; they are made to dwell in the Darkness, and the dark mountain swallows them up, until 'the day', the day of judgement and until the hour, the hours of deliverance.' We who praise [thee,] our Lord, our sins and our guilt thou wilt remit for us.» Here, then, the escape from judgement for the believers is conjoined with the *self*-judgement of the wicked, as in Jn 3^{18}.

GL III 4 512^{22-31} (*Pet* 79^{15-20}) *MLi Qolasta XCII* 157^{7-11}

אלמיא כאנפיא לדינא ודינא מינאיהון מיתמאר דינא מיתמאר מינאיהון דלאבאר
עובאדיא דגבאר כשיט אנאת בלהודאך בהירא דאביא מאנא סקילא דסקילת
דלאולית לבית דינא ודינא מינאך לאמיתמאר דינא מינאך דאבאדת
עיבאדיא דגבאר כשיט

»The worlds gather for judgement, and judgement is delivered on them, judgement is delivered on them because they have not done the works of a truthful man. Thou, alone, O elect [and] pure one, thou shining Mana, who doth shine[1], *shalt not go to the assize*[2], and *judgement shall not be delivered on thee,* not on thee shall judgement be delivered since thou hast done the works of a truthful man!» Here the notions of the judgement to be executed on the wicked are within the traditional bounds.

A clear enunciation of the self-judgement of the wicked is, however, found in *GR V 2* $183^{11\,\mathrm{f.}}$ (*Pet* 180^{1}):

במהיתא דנאפשאיהון ניתימהון ומהיתאי דיליא לאתיהויא עלאואיהון

»*By their own blow[s] they shall be stricken* and my blow shall not (need to) come upon them.»

The idea of the self-condemnation of the Wicked by their love of the Darkness and their evil deeds is also expressed in

---

[1] The spirit of the believer is meant.

[2] בית דינא, cf. the Jewish בית דין.

M Joh L 179 18—21 (*T* 182 11—13)

דבעדה אואר אינה מאן האוילה אסיא דבקארנה פאייס עוהרה
מאן האוילה אדיכלא

»He who by his [own] hand blinds his eye, who shall be for him a healer; he who with his own horn destroys his road, who shall be for him a roadmender?»[1]

It is remarkable that there exists a very close parallel between the Mandæan conception of the self-judgement of the wicked and a Rabbinic dictum conveying the same idea. Fire being of old the symbol of the punishment, or the means of punishment, the self-judgement could be symbolized by the fire as quelling forth from within a wicked man and devouring him. Thus *GR V 3* 183 (*Pet* 179/180) referred to above has: »Fire will blaze out from their [own] face, it will destroy the spot between their shoulders [the seat of the Mana] and punish them for their pride». Similarly *Gen R,* 6 10 runs:

ר׳ ינאי ור״ש תרווייהו אמרין אין גיהנם אלא יום שהוא מלהט
את הרשעים. מה טעם הנה יום בא בוער כתנור וגו׳. רבנן אמרי
יש גיהנם. שנאמר נאם ה׳ אשר אור לו בציון וגו׳. ר׳ יהודה בר
אלעי אומר לא יום ולא גיהנם אלא אש שהיא יוצאה מגופן של
רשעים ומלהטת אותן מ״ט דכתיב תהרו חשש תלדו קש רוחכם
אש תאכלכם.

»R. Yannai and R. Šimʿon both said: 'There is no Gehenna; it is [the] 'day' that burns the wicked. Why? (Because it is written in *Mal.* 4 1:) For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven etc.' Our teachers say: 'There is a Gehenna; for it is written (*Isa* 31 9): Sayth the Lord; who has a fire in Sion [and a furnace in Jerusalem]'. R. Yᵉhuđā bar ʿÆlʿay [of the school R. ʿᴬqibā] said: 'Not a day nor Gehenna [are the means of punishment], but a fire that goes forth from the body of the wicked and burns them. Why? Because it is written (*Isa* 33 11): 'Ye shall conceive chaff, ye shall bring forth stubble; your breath as a fire shall devour you'.»[2]

The background of Jn 3 16—21, as has already been said, is formed by the ideas centering in the antithesis between the two spheres of realities: one that of Faith — Freedom of Judgement and Death — Salvation — attainment of Life — Love of Light — Works of Truth 'wrought in God', the other that of refusal to believe — Judgement and Death — Perdition — Darkness — Evil Deeds. To this general nexus of ideas there are frequent parallels in Rabbinic:

---

[1] Quoted by Bultmann, *Neuerschl. Mand. u. Man. Qu.* p. 111 as illustrating: »Aber nicht alle wollen das Licht sehen».

[2] The opinion was of course heterodox. It is significant that the commentary, *Mattᵉnoþ Kᵉhunnā*, passes R. Yᵉhuđā's words in silence.

Mek 13 d 14 a

ויאמינו בה׳ ובמשה עבדו. אם במשה האמינו ק״ו בה׳ בא זה
ללמדך שכל מי שמאמין ברועה נאמן כאלו מאמין במאמר מי
שאמר והיה העולם. כיוצא בדבר אתה אומר וידבר העם באלהים
ובמשה אם באלהים דברו ק״ו במשה אזב״ל שכל מי שמדבר
ברועה נאמן כאלו מדבר במי שאמר והיה העולם. גדולה האמונה
שהאמינו ישראל במי שאמר והיה העולם שבשכר שהאמינו ישר׳
בה׳ שרתה עליהם רוה״ק ואמרו שירה שנ׳ ויאמינו בה׳ ובמשה
[14 a] עבדו וכו׳ אז ישיר משה ובני ישר׳ וכן אתה מוצא שלא ירש
אברהם אבינו העולם הזה והעולם הבא אלא בזכות אמנה שהאמין
בה׳ שנ׳ והאמין בה׳ ויחשבהו לו צדקה. ... ר׳ נחמיה אומר כל
המקבל עליו מצוה אחת באמנה כדאי הוא שתשרה עליו רוה״ק שכן
מצינו ... במשה ובדוד ובדבורה שאמרו שירה ושרת עליהם רוה״ק
וכן את מוצא שלא נגאלו ישראל ממצר׳ אלא בשכר האמנה שנ׳
ויאמן העם ובה״א אמונים נוצר ה׳ מזכיר אמונות אבות ואהרן
וחור תמכו בידים זה השער לה׳ צדיקים יבאו בו בבעלי אמנה מהו
אומר ויבא גוי צדיק שומר אמונים שער זה כל בעלי אמונה נכנסין
בו טוב להודות... ואמונתך בלילות... כי שמחתני ה׳ בפעלך
במעשה ידיך ארנן מי גרם לבא לידי שמחה זו שכר אמנ׳ שהאמינו
אבותינו בעולם הזה שכלו לילה שכך נאמר להגיד בבקר חסדך
ואמונתך בלילות.

»'And [the people] believed in the Lord and in his servant Moses (*Exod* 14^{31}).' If they *believed* in Moses, it follows that they believed in the Lord. [Why, then, are both mentioned?] It is to teach you, that *every one who believes in a faithful shepherd* [is regarded] *as if he believed in the word of him who spoke, and the world was* [*i.e.* who created the world by his word]. It is the same with the word you read [in *Num* 21^{5}]: 'And the people spake against God and against Moses'. If they spoke against God, naturally they spoke against Moses! But the word comes to teach you that *everyone who speaks against a faithful shepherd [is considered] as if he had spoken against him who spoke, and the world was.* Great is the faith, with which Israel believed in him who spoke and the world was, for by recompense of their believing in the Lord *the Holy Spirit remained (dwelled) on them*[1] and they sang a song[2] as is written: 'and believed in the Lord and in his servant Moses' and 'then sang Moses and the children of Israel (*Exod* 15^{1})'. And likewise you find that Abraham our father did not inherit this world and the world to come except by virtue of the faith with which he believed in the Lord, as it is said (*Gen* 15^{6}): 'And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness'.[3] R. Nᵉḥæmyā said: Every one who takes upon himself one commandment in faith is worthy that the Holy Spirit rest upon him ... And so we find with regard to Moses and David and Debora that they sang a song, the Holy Spirit remaining upon them; and likewise you find that *Israel were not saved* out of Egypt *except by virtue* (recompense) *of the faith,* as it is said: '[Thus the Lord saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians] ... and the people ... believed'. (*Exod* $14^{29\text{f.}}$). And thus it is said (*Ps* 31^{23}): 'The Lord preserveth the faithful'. [And similarly the Scripture] remembers the faith of the fathers, [as it is said, *Exod* 17^{12}]: 'and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, [the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were faithful[4]]; similarly (*Ps* 118^{20}): 'This is the *gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter*'.[5] What does it say with reference to the men of faith? 'Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the faith may enter in' (*Isa* 26^{2}). *Through this gate all the men of faith enter.* [Further it is said, *Ps* 92^{1-4}]: 'It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord ... to shew forth ... thy faith in the nights ... For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work: I will rejoice in the works of thy hands.' What was it that caused him to come into this joy? The recompense of *the faith with which our fathers believed in this world which is wholly night,* for thus it is said: 'to shew forth thy lovingkindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night'.» Here, in this way, are represented the ideas of faith in God and his Messenger — salvation — righteousness (= works of truth) contrasted with rejection of God and his Messenger, — this world — night — darkness.

---

[1] Cf. Jn 1^{33}.

[2] by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

[3] Cf. *Rm* $4^{3,9}$.

[4] thus to be rendered acc. to the context.

[5] Cf. Jn 10^{9} cfd with 3^{16}.

The deeds of the righteous are connected with Light and the deeds of the wicked with Darkness:

Gen R 3 10

א"ר ינאי מתחלת ברייתו של עולם צפה הקב"ה מעשיהן של צדיקים ומעשיהן של רשעים והארץ היתה תהו אלו מעשיהן של רשעים ויאמר אלהים יהי אור אלו מעשיהן של צדיקים ויבדל אלהים בין האור ובין החשך בין מעשיהן של צדיקים למעשיהן של רשעים ויקרא אלהים לאור יום אלו מעשיהן של צדיקים ולחושך קרא לילה אלו מעשיהן של רשעים ויהי ערב אלו מעשיהן של רשעים ויהי בקר אלו מעשיהן של צדיקים

»R. Yannai said: 'From the beginning of the creation of the world the Holy One, blessed be He, beheld the *works of the righteous* and the *works of the wicked;* 'and the earth was without form and void (*Gen* 1 2)', this is the works of the wicked; 'and God said, Let there be *light* (*Gen* 1 3)', this refers to the *works of the righteous;* 'and God divided the light from the darkness (*ib.*)', *i.e.* the works of the righteous from the works of the wicked; 'And God called the *light Day* (*Gen* 1 5)', this refers to *the works of the righteous;* 'and the *darkness* he called *Night* (*ib.*)', this is the *works of the wicked;* 'and it was evening (*Gen* 1 8)', this is the works of the wicked; 'and it was morning' (*ib.*), this is the works of the righteous'.»[1]

Lev R 27 1

ר' יהודה ב"ר אמר . . . כך אמר הב"ה גיהנם חשך דכתיב יהי דרכם חשך וחלקלקו' והתהום חשך שנאמר וחשך על פני תהום והרשעים חשך שנאמר והיה במחשך מעשיהם יבא חשך ויכסהו חשך שנאמר כי בהבל בא ובחשך ילך ובחשך שמו יכוסה

»R. Yehuđā b. 'Ælʿay, in the name of an anonymous Rabbi, said: . . . thus saith the Holy one: Gehenna is Darkness, as it is written: 'Let their way be dark and slippery, [and let the angel of the

---

[1] Cf. the similar passage, *Gen R* 1 8, quoted by Schoettgen, *HHetT*, p. 332, and Billerbeck, ii p. 427, and *Gen R* 2 7, quoted by Billerbeck, *ib.* pp. 427, 428, cf. also *Gen R* 2 4.

Lord, *i.e.* the angel of death persecute them *Ps* 35^{6}] and the *Tʿhōm* is Darkness as it is said: 'and darkness was upon the face of Tᵉhōm (the deep; *Gen* 1^{2})' and the Wicked are Darkness, as it is said: 'And their works are in the dark (*Isa* 29^{15})', and darkness shall come and cover him (the wicked), as is written: 'For he cometh in with vanity, and departeth in darkness and his name shall be covered with darkness (*Eccl* 6^{4}).

Gen R 6 14

ולמשול ביום ובלילה וגו' א"ר אילפא אם לענין המאורות הלא כבר נאמר את
המאור הגדול לממשלת היום וגו' ומה ת"ל ולמשול ביום ובלילה אלא אלו
הצדיקים שהן שילטין במה שנברא להאיר ביום ובמה שנברא להאיר בלילה
הה"ד וידם השמש וירח עמד עד יקם גוי אויביו

»And to rule over the day and over the night etc. [*Gen* 1^{18}] R.'Ilfa (2nd *gen. Pal. Amor.*) said: 'Do these words refer to the lights (*scil* of *Gen* 1^{16})? Has not the scripture just said (*Gen* 1^{16}): 'the greater light to rule the day etc.'? And why does the scripture say [in the present verse]: 'and to rule over the day and over the night?' Answer: the latter are the righteous who rule over that which has been created to give light in the day and over that which has been created to give light in the night. For it is said (*Jos* 10^{13}): 'And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies'.

The acceptance of the Divine word gives Life, exempts from Death and Condemnation symbolized by the Angel of Death. On the other hand the angel of death is the ruler of this world, the world of darkness and evil deeds. Through evil doings, which are essentially to be regarded as a deviation from God and his world, man merges himself into the World of Darkness:

Lev R 18 3

א"ר יוחנן בשם ר' אליעזר בנו של ר' יוסי הגלילי בשעה שעמדו ישראל על הר
סיני ואמרו כל אשר דבר יי' נעשה ונשמע באותה שעה קרא הקב"ה למלאך
המות ואמר לו אעפ"י שעשיתי אותך קוזמוקרטר על הברייות אין לך עסק
באומה זו למה שהן בני הה"ד בנים אתם לה' אלהים ויאומר ויהי כשמעכם את
הקול מתוך החשך וכי יש השך למעלה והכתיב ונהורא עמה שרא אלא ה
מלאך המות שקרוי חשך הה"ד והלוחות מעשה אלהים המה וגו' אל תקרי
חרות אלא חירות . . . ר' יהודה אמר חירות ממלאך המות

»R. Yoḥᵃnān said in the name of R. ᴬᴱliʿæzær, the son of R. Yose the Galilean: In the hour when Israel stood on the mount of Sinai and said: 'All the words which the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient (*Exod* 24^{1})', in that hour the Holy One called the *Angel of Death* and said to him: 'Although I have made thee a ϰοσμοϰράτωρ *(world-ruler)* over the created beings, *thou shall [henceforth] have no business with this people*, for they are my sons (children). This is the meaning of the word: 'Ye are *children of the Lord God*'. And he said: 'And it came to pass, when ye heard the voice out of the midst of the darkness (*Deut.* 5^{23})'. Is there then *darkness* on high? Is it not written (*Dan* 2^{22}): 'and the light dwelleth with him'? Answer: *[the darkness refers to] the angel of death who is called Darkness.* This is what is written (*Exod* 52^{16}): 'And the tables [of the testimony] were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven [חרות, *ḥārūþ*] upon the tables'. Do not read חרות [*ḥārūþ*, 'graven'] but חירות [*ḥērūþ*, 'freedom'] . . . R. Yᵉhuđā said: that is, *freedom from the angel of death*'.» The children of God, of Light, are freed from judgement and death.

TB Kᵉþubbōþ 111 a

א״ר אלעזר עמי הארצות אינן חיים שנ׳ מתים בל יחיו וגו׳ תניא
נמי הכי מתים בל יחיו יכול לכל ת״ל רפאים בל יקומו במרפה
עצמו מדברי תורה הכתוב מדבר א״ל ר׳ יוחנן לא ניחא למרייהו
דאמרת להו הכי ההוא במרפה עצמו לע״א הוא דכתיב א״ל מקרא
אחר אני דורש דכתיב כי טל אורות טלך וארץ רפאים תפיל כל
המשתמש באור תורה אור תורה מחייהו וכל שאין משתמש באור
תורה אין אור תורה מחייהו

»R. ᴬᴱlʿāzār said: the profane people are not living: as it is written (*Isa* 26^{14}): '*They are dead, they shall not live etc.*' There is Bāraiþā also here: 'they are dead, they shall not live': possibly to all? [= if these words had been written alone, they could have been interpreted as referring to all mankind]. The scripture [,however, continues and] says: 'The Rᵉfā'im shall not rise'; the scripture speaks of the one who separates *(mᵉrappæ)*[1] himself from the words of the Tora'. R. Yoḥᵃnān said: . . . it refers to those who turn to idolatry . . . He said to him: another passage I will [adduce and] expound: 'thy dew[1] is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the rᵉfāʾim': *every one who makes use of the Light of the Tora, him the Light of the Tora makes living*, and *every one who does not make use of the Tora, to him the Light of the Tora does not give Life*'.

---

[1] playing upon the similarity between רפאים *(rᵉfā'im)* and מרפה *(mᵉrappæ)*.

TB ʿAb Zārā 8 a

מיום שסרחתי עולם חשוך בעדי

»(Adam says): From the day when I sinned, the world was darkened for me.»

Cf. the dictum: when Adam turned away from the knowledge (*i.e.* laws, or world) of God to that of the serpent, the Light was taken from Him. Works done לדעתו של הקב"ה compares with Jn 3^{21}: ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἐστιν εἰργασμένα.

TB Pᵉsaḥ. 30 a

והיה ביום ההוא לא יהיה אור יקרו' וקיפאון מאי יקרות וקיפאון א"ר אלעזר זה אור שיקר בעולם הזה וקיפוי לעולם הבא . . . ור' יהושע בן לוי אמר אלו בני אדם שיקרין הן בעולם הזה וקפויין הן לעולם הבא . . .

»'And it shall come to pass in that day that the light shall not be clear nor dark (*Zech* 14^{6}).' To what do the words 'clear' and 'dark' refer? R. ʾÆlʿāzār said: This is the light that is clear in this world but dark in the world to come . . . and R. Yᵉhošūaʿ C. Leui said: the words refer to those children of men who are glorious in this world but dark in the world to come'.[2]

TB Pᵉsaḥ 2 b: This world resembles the night, the world to come resembles the day[3], *ib.* 2 a: the sun will rise for the righteous in the world to come.[4]

---

[1] interpreted in the sense of the Dew of Life, of Vivification, cf. above p. 54 f.

[2] the wicked; cf. *Lc* 6$^{24\text{ ff.}}$ 16^{25}.

[3] *TB Pᵉsaḥ.* 2 b

ואומר אך חשך ישופני ולילה אור בעדני (*Ps* 139^{11}) אלמא אור יממא היא התם הכי קאמר דוד אני אמרתי אך חשך ישופני לעולם הבא שהוא דומה ליום עכשיו העולם הזה שהוא דומה ללילה אור בערני

[4] *TB Pᵉsaḥ.* 2 a

ובאור בקר יזרח שמש (2 Sam 23^{4}) אלמא אור יממא הוא מי כתיב אור בקר ובאור בקר כתיב והכי קאמר ובאור בקר בעולם הזה כעין זריחת שמש לצדיקים לעולם הבא

For the expression 'loved the darkness' (Jn 3^{19}) reference may be made to *Num R* 9 6 (also *Tanḥ Nissā* 5) quoted by Schœttgen[1] and Billerbeck[2]: 'She (referring to an adulteress) loved the darkness [אפילה]'. Perhaps this passage does not use the word אפילה in the same technical sense in which the Rabbinic dicta quoted above, and Jn 3^{19-21}, use the words חשך and σκότος respectively.

For ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, Hebrew: עושה אמת, Aramaic: עביד קושטא *vide Yalq. Nᵉbi'im* 14, quoted by Schœttgen[3], and *Targ* to *Hos* 4^{1}, quoted by Billerbeck[4] and cf. the corresponding expression, עבד שקרא (do the lie), in Targum passages quoted by Schœttgen.[5]

Another aspect of the relation between Light and Darkness is touched

TB Tāmiđ (31 b) 32 a

י' דברים שאל אלכסנדרוס מוקדן את זקני הנגב... אמר להן אור נברא תחילה או חושך אמרו לו מילתא דא אין להתפתר... אמר להן מה יעבד איניש ויחיה אמרו ליה ימית עצמו מה יעביד איניש וימות יחיה את עצמו אמר להן מה יעביד איניש ויתקבל על ברייתא אמרו יסני מלכו ושלטן

»Ten questions did Alexander of Macedonia ask the Elders of southern Palestine. [Among the questions was this:] Which was created first, Light or Darkness? They answered: That subject is not to be explained (*i.e.* must not be entered upon publicly).« The Rabbinic teachers regarded this question as belonging to the subjects which were apt to lead into heretical, probably dualistic views. This is also hinted at in the sequel where it is stated, that the Elders feared that Alexander, if obtaining an answer, would have entered upon the speculations of the things 'above, below, before and after' which were not permissible. The dictum should he compared with the Mandaitic passages quoted above p. 125 (»the Light is older than the Darkness etc.«). The notions expressed there were evidently not unknown to the Rabbis. Cf. *GenR* 1_{21}.

---

[1] *op. cit.* p. 333.

[2] *op. cit.* ii, p. 428.

[3] *op. cit* p. 334, 1: כל שעושה אמת מקוים

[4] *op. cit.* p. 429.

[5] *op. cit.* pp. 334, 335, *Targ* to *Lev* 19^{35}, *Deut* 25^{16}, *Jerem* 8^{10}, *Ps* 53^{15}, 99^{3}, 125^{5}, 141^{4}, *Hiob* 31^{3}, 34^{22}.

For the notion of the 'Son (= Messiah) not judging but saving' reference must be made to the discussion on 5^{27} and 12^{31}.

The Rabbinic conceptions of the Light of the Messiah, as »the Light which surrounds the Messiah and which he mediates to the righteous, often identified with the original Light which God detracted from the world on account of man's sins and preserved for the righteous»[1] are set forth exhaustively by Billerbeck.[2]

Similarly it suffices to refer to Billerbeck[3] for a résumé of the Rabbinic use of the expression 'Light of the World' or 'the Light that comes to the world'. As 'the Light of the World' (אורו של עולם or נרו של עולם) are represented: (1) The Holy One: *Tanḥ. Bᵉhaʿᵃlop̄ᵉkā* 4, ii 61 b, (2) The first man: *TY Šab* 5 b, cf. *TB Šab* 31 b, (3) Israel *Cant R* 14, fol. 5 a (to *Cant* 1^3)[4], (4) Tora and the Temple *TB Bab̄. Bāp̄.* 4 a, (5) Jerusalem *GenR* 59 8, (6) eminent saints and teachers, *e.g.* Yohᵃnan bæn Zakkai: *'Ab̄. R. Nāp̄.* 25.

For an investigation into the specific connotations of the term φῶς — an investigation which must needs be based on Wetter's fundamental treatise on the subject[5] — reference must be made to the discussion on Jn $12^{35,36}$.

With a background of the widely ramified current ideas related to Jn 3^{16-21} of which some examples have been given above, it may be possible to determine the exact bearing of Jn 3^{16-21} on the preceding context. This bearing may be summed up as follows:

(1) The κόσμος, in the sense of the 'human world', does not by nature and necessity belong to the ἐπίγεια, the lower, 'physical' realities, in which it lives, or with which it has identified itself.

(2) God loves the world, and because of this love, he wills that the world should not remain identified with the ἐπίγεια but be '*saved*'.

(3) God has made an act of love, viz. sent as a Divine gift to the world his only-begotten Son who in himself comprises all Divine gifts and all Divine Efflux from the Divine world to the earthly world. He is Life and Light and Truth.

---

[1] Billerbeck ii 428.

[2] Billerbeck i 151, 161 quoting *P̄ᵉsiq R* 36^3 and *P̄ᵉsiq* 149 a ii 348.

[3] Billerbeck i 236—238.

[4] מה השמן הזה מביא אור לעולם כך ישראל אור' לעולם

[5] G. P. Wetter, *Phōs* (ΦΩΣ), Upsala and Leipzig 1915.

(4) The human world, not being of one essence with the earthly world, has in itself something latent which makes it possible for the human beings to receive the Divine gift.

(5) This latent something is the true nature of man; the human world in its ideal state belongs to the Divine world; its object is to return to the Divine, to the Light.

(6) Why is it, that only a part of the human world is saved, receives the Divine gift? The reason is, that only a few human beings actuate the spiritual element in themselves. This activation is termed 'do the truth', 'to do works in God'.

(7) To 'do the truth' is the preparation and condition for the first step from the terrestrial existence into the spiritual existence, *i.e.* it is also the preparation and condition for 'believing'; only in those who 'do the truth' can faith arise.

(8) The rise of faith in those who do the truth is connected with the arrival of the Light in the World; when the Light arrives into the world, those who do the truth recognize the Light, and 'come to the Light'.

(9) The Light coming into the World, or the Light of the World, is the Son of Man. This fact, however, is not here the main object of the teaching; one may ask, why the conception of the Light of the World is introduced here at all. The question is not answered merely by referring to the doctrine of the Prologue 1 4, 5, 9. The object seems to be twofold: (a) the antithesis of light and darkness being intimately bound up with the antithesis of righteousness and wickedness, of good deeds and evils deeds, the terms 'light' and 'darkness' are used here in order to emphasize the ethical aspect of human allegiance to one or the other of the two kinds of life, of existence, of realities: the spiritual and the terrestrial; men hate the Light and love the Darkness because their deeds are evil; the evil-doers do not come to the Light, they tend in the opposite direction, away from the Light. By this it is enunciated, that an evil-doer can never come to the Light, or believe, or enter the spiritual world.

(b) The Light is used to express that spiritual force or that spiritual activity from the Godhead through the Son, which can reach men and be recognized by them, even before they have begun their spiritual ascent or been born anew.

(10) The arrival of the Light into the Worlds entails a judgement, a κρίσις, דין, דינא. On this point Jn rejects the notion, which was frequently expressed in Rabbinic arguments respecting

the relation between God's mercy and justice, or love and judgement, that the *object* of the son's arrival was the judgement of the world. Indeed, in this connexion Jn is best understood, if Jewish terms and conceptions be applied. Those who have actuated the truth in them, come to the Light, and eo ipso, go in under the Divine Mercy and Love [חסד or רחמים], and escape the judgement; those who are carnally minded, the evil-doers, identify themselves with the world of Darkness, and thereby reject God's Love and enter under the Judgement. In the use of the term judgement the threefold sense of discrimination (division, 'sifting'[1]), verdict and condemnation is present.[2] This threefold sense, of course, attaches both to the Greek κρίσις and the Rabbinic דין. The words οὐ κρίνεται of Jn 3^{18}, however, probably link with the Jewish לא נידון in the sense of 'is not the object of the attribute of judgement, מדת הדין'. This is corroborated by the fact that the Son, who has not come to judge the world, is at the same time the judge of the world, not merely as the one by their attitude to whom men were immediately judged, but also as the one who 'executes judgement' (Jn 5^{27} ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν). This duplicity of 'escape from judgement in judgement' corresponds very well with the Jewish usage of the דין, according to which the דין, 'judgement' executed by the Holy One is defined as consisting in two Divine relations to man: that of דין or משפט, 'judgement' or 'justice', and חסד or רחמים, 'love' or 'mercy', in which also אמת, 'truth' figures prominently.[1] He who by his attitude towards God, by 'belief' אמונה[2] or obedience, has put himself under the attribute of חסד is not judged. This Jewish usage, it may be surmised, is here adopted and applied to man's attitude towards the Light.

---

[1] E. Carpenter, *JWr* p. 442: »The language of Jesus had the immediate effect of dividing his hearers into two opposite classes, those who acknowledge his claims and those who rejected them. This process of '*sifting*' was itself judgment. Believers needed it not; unbelievers had experienced it already; they had placed themselves in the ranks of the condemned (iii 16—18).»

ib. p. 443: »When the truth entered the world it began immediately to separate the seeing from the blind (with reference to Jn 9^{39}). Those whose eyes were opened recognised it at once, like the first disciples when they found the Messiah. Judgement of this kind was a natural *discrimination*. By their own characters men were self-allotted to one of two opposing groups. Thus though the Son was not sent into the world to judge it but to save it, he immediately became the ground of its moral partition.»

[2] Cf. A. Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*^{2} p. 168: »L'auteur ne se lasse pas de jouer sur les mots car il entend 'juger' et 'jugement' au triple sense de discernement, décision judiciaire et condamnation.»

Cf. W. Bauer, *JEv*^{2} pp. 55 f.: »Dabei ist zu beachten, dass auch κρίσις und κρίνειν 17—19 doppelsinnige Ausdrücke sind: 1. = Gericht, Verurteilung; 2. = Scheidung, Sonderung . . .»

(11) It is significant that the contrast to 'doing evil' is not 'doing good' but 'doing truth', and the contrast to the laying bare of the former as 'evil' is not the making the latter manifest as 'good' but as 'wrought in God'. It is not because of good deeds — nor indeed from the wish of having their good deeds made manifest and publicly known and appreciated either by God or men — that men 'come to the Light'. 'Doing the truth' is not equivalent with 'performing good deeds' but, as we have already tried to express, with actuating one's true being or that residue of spiritual essence that tends towards the realisation of one's true being. In this actuation, when met by the Light, there is an aspiration upwards, an aspiration towards communion with God. The goal is: »that his deeds may be made manifest as wrought in God.»

To understand what is meant by the expression ἐν θεῷ εἰργασμένα it suffices to recall the passages which speak of J as doing the Father's works and of the believers as doing, through him, God's works also: ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτός (14^{10}); ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι (5^{17}); ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με (9^{4}); τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου (10^{25}); τί ποιῶμεν ἵνα ἐργαζώμεθα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ; (6^{28}) πιστεύετέ μοι ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί . . . ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ τὰ ἔργα, ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, κἀκεῖνος ποιήσει (14$^{11, 12}$). The works done 'in God' are the works done in devotion to the Divine Will, in unity with God, by him who has entered the spiritual world and become a spiritual being. He who 'doeth the truth' comes to the Light, the Son, believes in Him, is made free by the Truth (8^{32}) from the bondage of the ἐπίγεια, the lower world, the darkness, and attains to the Divine world, where all activity is an activity 'in God'.[3] Hence vs. 21, from 'doeth the truth' to 'deeds ... wrought in God', pictures the whole process of spiritual attainment treated of in 3^{3-20}, from the initial actuation of the Divine spark in man, the response to the Light, the belief in the Son of Man, the aspiration upwards met by the Son's drawing man upwards with and in himself, the ascent to the spiritual world, the birth into the Kingdom of Heaven, the attainment of Eternal Life and the glorious fulfilment in a life consisting in an activity wholly in devotion and unity with the Divine Will, with God. Thus Jn 3^{3-21} may rightly be considered as comprising the fundamental elements of the whole Jn-ine representation of the teaching of J.[1]

---

[1] Cf. *3 En* 31^{1,2} and Box, *Ezra Apocalypse* p. 122 note on 7^{34}.

[2] Cf. above p. 138 f.

[3] Cf. P. Gardner, *The Ephesian Gospel*, pp. 271 ff.: »There are certain aspects in which religious and spiritual truth presents itself to the Evangelist... In the first place, the acceptance of truth seems to him an escape from bondage into a glorious liberty. »The truth shall make you free»: that is, union with

For an understanding of the dialogue of Jn 4^{7-26} between J and the Samaritan woman there are three different aspects to be considered namely (1) the teaching on the living water (2) the discourse on the true form of worship (3) the controversy between the doctrine of J and the specific kind of religious belief represented by the Samaritan woman, with a side-view on the Jewish religion.

The teaching on the living water begins with vs. 10: ... εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγων σοι· δός μοί π(ι)εῖν, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτόν, καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν. It is introduced by a reference to the 'gift of God': We have already, in treating of Jn 3^{3-21}, shown what an essential element the conception of the Divine gift forms in the Jn-ine salvation-doctrine, and that it belongs to the class of conceptions which are viewed

---

Christ shall set you free from the bondage of sin and death ... Another teaching of the Evangelist, ... which runs, indeed, like a golden thread through all Christian teaching, is devotion to the Divine Will. »I came not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me» is an expression of the spirit of the Master's life which is seen not only in the acts of the historic Jesus, but in the lives of all His true followers, from that day to this. Cf. *ib.* pp. 268, 269: »It is clear that in such passages as these (Jn 8^{32} 18^{37} 14^{17} 14^{6}) the reference is not to any verbal teaching, however lofty, but to the faith which unites the disciples to the Master, and makes of the two one mystical body ... This is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and Him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ (17^{3}). *To know* in this passages is clearly not to be aware of, or to be convinced of, the existence of God and Christ, but to have communion with them through the Spirit.» This is more in accordance with the interpretation arrived at above than e.g. that of Bauer, *JEv*² p. 57 acc. to which the 'doing the truth' of 3^{21} means »ein Wirken, wie es die wahre Gotteserkenntnis eingiebt».

[1] Cf. W. Bauer, *JEv*² p. 59: »Am richtigsten fasst man die Perikope als ein Programm der gesamten Verkündigung des Evangelisten mit ihren teils lehrhaften, teils apologetisch-polemischen Zielen auf».

under the aspect of κατάβασις. Here the conception is represented as a notion familiar to the Samaritan woman, the right knowledge and understanding of which, however, she lacked. The use of the δωρεὰ τοῦ θεοῦ as a technical term is presupposed.

The Rabbinic comments upon the OT references to God as the giver of various gifts, especially attached to passages where God occurs as the subject of the verb נתן (give), evolve the conception of the מתנה, pl. מתנות, of God. The gift, or act of giving, κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, is the Tora, or the Divine promulgation of the Tora. For this the specific term מתן תורה, the giving of the Tora, is developed.

As typical passages the following may be quoted.

GenR 6 7:

א"ר יוחנן ג' דברים נתנו מתנה לעולם ואלו הן התורה והמאורות והגשמים התורה מנין שנא' ויתן אל משה וגו' המאורות מנין שנא' ויתן אותם אלהים ברקיע השמים גשמים מנין שנא' ונתתי גשמיכם בעתם. ר'עזריה בשם ר' יהודה ב"ר סימון אומר אף השלום שנא' ונתתי שלום בארץ ר' יהושע ב"ר נחמי' אמר אף הישועה שנא' ותתן לי מגן ישעך ר' תנחומא אמר אף ארץ ישראל שנא' ויתן להם ארצות גוים וגו' וי"א אף הנקמה באדום שנא' ונתתי נקמתי באדום וגו' רבנן אמרי אף הרחמים שנא'. ויתן אותם לרחמים לפני כל שוביהם ר' יצחק בר מריון אומר אף הפרשת הים הגדול שנא' כה אמר ה' הנותן בים דרך וגו'.

»R. Yoḥ^{a}nān said: Three things were given to the world as a gift, and they are these: *Tora*, the *Lights* and the *Rain* . . . R. ^{ʿA}zaryā, in the name of R. Y^{e}huđa after R. Simon said: '*Peace* also [was given as a gift]'. . . . R. Y^{e}hošu^{a}ʿ, in the name of R. N^{e}hæmyā said: 'Even *Salvation*' . . . R. Tanḥuma said: 'Even the *land of Israel*'. . . . And some say: 'Even vengeance on Rome' . . . Our teachers say: 'Even *Mercy*'. . . . R. Iṣhāq bar Miryon said: 'Even the division of the Great Sea' (referring to Exod. 14 $^{16, 21, 22}$).

TB B^{e}rāk̄ōþ 5 a; a *Bāraiþā:*

תניא ר' שמעון בן יוחאי אומר ג' מתנות טובות נתן הקב"ה לישראל וכולן לא נתנן אלא על ידי יסורין אלו הן תורה וארץ ישראל והעולם הבא.

Mek 27 e (*Iiprŏ* 10):

ר' שמעון בן יוחאי אומר חביבי' יסורי' ששלש מתנות טובות נתנו לישראל ואומות העולם מתאוין להם ולא נתנו אלא בייסורין ואלו הן תורה וארץ ישראל ועולם הבא.

»R. Šim'on bæn Iohai said: [Precious are the afflictions, for] three good gifts are given to Israel [— and the nations of the world desire them greatly —] and they are given only together with tribulations; and these they are: *Tora*, the *land of Israel* and the *future world.*»

Sifre 35 d 36 a § 42, *Miđr. Tann.* 35:

ונתת מטר ארצכם בעתו יורה ומלקוש ונתתי אני לא על ידי מלאך ולא על ידי השליח . . . ומניין שניתנה ברכה אחת לישראל שכל הברכות כלולות בה שנ' אוהב כסף לא ישבע כסף.

»'And I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain (*Deut.* 11^{14}); 'And I will give unto you': that is, *I myself not through an angel and not through the messenger* . . . And whence do we know that one blessing was given to Israel, in which all the blessings were included (comprehended) (*i.e.* so that nothing else could be desired or so that nothing was felt as wanting). [Answer: From a consideration of the words of *Eccl.* 5^{10}, where] it is said: 'He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver'.» The idea is that the Divine gift, which is a gift coming directly from God, implies complete and permanent satisfaction, in contrast to other gifts and blessings which leave the receiver unsatisfied. Cf. Jn $4^{13, 14}$: πᾶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου διψήσει πάλιν. ὃς δ'ἂν πίῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

TY Qidd 65 c *Sanh.* 23 d:

שלש מתנות טובות נתן הקב"ה לישראל רחמנין ובויישנין וגומלי חסדים.

»Three good gifts did the Holy One give to Israel: [*viz.* to be] compassionate, humble (modest) and charitable.» These moral gifts are really considered as inherent in the gift of the Tora, since accruing from the observance of the Tora.

It is noticeable that the Divine gifts are thought of as tended to Israel exclusively. It would seem that the very term, 'gift', implied the notion of a special favour bestowed on Israel only. The Divine gift may originally have been offered to the whole world, to all nations, but Israel alone accepted it.

For the conception of 'the gift (*δωρεά*) which God has sent' in *Corp. Herm.* IV 5, cf. above p. 74 l. 13 and p. 75 l. 2, where it refers to the νοῦς sent down from heaven to the human world.[1]

The right knowledge of the Divine Gift is at once identified with the knowledge of J.: **καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγων σοι** . . . The true Divine Gift, acc. to Jn, is mediated only by J as the Messiah (4^{26}) and the Messenger (4^{34}). Cf. the Rabbinic refutation of the idea of mediation of the Divine gift either by a celestial being (angel) or by *the* Messenger, above p. 151.

The import of the passage: εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγων σοι . . . is really identical with that of Jn 3^{16}. It may also be surmised that the discourse on the Divine gift in Jn 3^{27-36}, attributed to John the Baptist, relates to the present utterance. »A man (ἄνθρωπος) can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven (3^{21})»; only *one* man (ἄνθρωπος), however, has received from heaven, namely Messiah (3^{28}), the Messenger (3^{24}), the Son (3^{35}); and he, on the other hand, has received *all* gifts: »The Father loveth the Son, and hath *given all things* into his hand.» (3^{35}, cf. 13^{3}.) The Son comprises in himself all the divine gifts, hence no-one can receive any gift from heaven except through him. But he who comes to the Son and believes in him, receives that which gives access to all Divine gifts: the Eternal (Celestial, Divine) Life (3^{36}). Probably in the background, behind each reference, there lies also the idea that the mediator and the gifts in the last instance are one, a thought clearly expressed in Jn 3^{16} and $6^{35, 41, 48, 53\,\mathrm{ff.}}$

The Divine gift given by the Messiah is here viewed as the *'Living Water'*. The living water is put in contrast to the water from the well with which the Samaritan woman was concerned. The features that seem to convey some intentional meaning are: (1) the well of the Samaritan woman is Jacob's well, *i.e.* the well given to the Samaritans by their 'father Jacob', (2) the well is deep, (3) its water does not give lasting satisfaction to those who draw from it, (4) the living water that J confers gives lasting satisfaction, (5) he who receives the gift of the living water receives also a well of water, but this is a well within himself, (6) this well and its water become the sources of eternal life.

---

[1] The passage is called attention to in annexion with Jn 4^{10} also by Bauer, J *Ev*^{2} p. 64.

For the conceptions of the 'water' and the 'well or fountain or spring of water' in a symbolical sense, and of the 'drinking' of the water or the 'drawing' from the 'well', the following parallel passages may be deemed important.

I En 48[1] »And in that place (heaven) I saw the *fountain of righteousness* which was *inexhaustible:* and around it were many *fountains of wisdom;* and all the *thirsty drank of them*, and were *filled with wisdom.*» The water seems here in the first place to be righteousness, *i.e.* right living. This is, however, really identical with wisdom, since wisdom is contained in righteousness and righteousness in wisdom.

I En 49 (describing »the power and wisdom of the Elect One»): »For *wisdom* is *poured out like water* . . . because the *Elect One* standeth before the Lord of Spirits . . . and *in him dwells the spirit of wisdom.*» Here water is clearly set forth as a symbol of wisdom. Important is the parallel of the wisdom as inherent in the Elect One, who is thought of as the one who mediates to men what Divine attributes he has received.

I En 96[6] »Woe to you who drink *water from every fountain.* For suddenly shall ye be consumed and wither away, because ye have *forsaken the fountain of life.* (Moral life, right religion).» Here the fountain of life, implying right living and faith, is contrasted with fountains giving water which represents false knowledge and evil deeds and leads to destruction.

I En 65[11 f.] »(Enoch tells Noah:) »but as for thee, my son, the Lord of Spirits knows that thou art pure . . . and He has destined thy name to be among the holy, and will preserve thee amongst those who dwell on the earth, . . . and *from thy seed shall proceed a fountain of the righteous and holy without number for ever.*» The fountain here symbolises the procreation of generations of righteous and holy men »for ever», *i.e.* into eternity. The expression recalls Jn 3[14]: τὸ ὕδωρ, ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ, γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Cf. below p. 168.

I En 22[9] In the Šeol or the Place of the spirits of the deceased, Enoch beholds the division »made for the spirits of the righteous, in which there is *the bright spring of water*». The spring of water here represents the eternal effluence of life enjoyed by the spirits of the righteous in the hereafter. But there is a counterpart in the water of punishment: those who have on earth drunk of the water of sensual pleasures shall in the spiritual state see this water changed into a consuning water of punishment.

1 En 67 8 »Those waters shall in those days serve for the kings and the mighty and the exalted, and those who dwell on the earth, for the healing of the body but for the punishment of the spirit» cf. 67 11, 13.

[1 En 17 4 »And they (the angels) took me to the living waters» (variant: »the waters of life»), refers to the cosmical water.]

In the so-called *Sadoqite Fragments,* emanating from a certain Jewish circle in Damascus 'the well of waters of life' or 'the spring of living water' is also a fixed term. The well is explicitly identified with the Tora, but Tora is also here connected with (Eternal) Life and with Knowledge, Understanding or Wisdom. Further the conception of the 'well' is brought into relation with that of the »Teacher of Righteousness in the end of days», *i.e.* the Messiah who when he comes »will tell us all things (Jn 4 25)».

Zad. Fragm. 9 28 (rec. B):

ובמשפט הזה לכל המאס במצ־ת אל ויעזבם ויפנו בשרירות לבם
כן כל האנשים אש־ באו בברית החדשה בא־ץ דמשק ושבו ויבגד־
ויס־רו מבא־ מים החיים.[1]

»And such [will be] the case of all who reject the commandments of God, and forsake them and turn away in the stubbornness of their heart. So are all the men who entered into the new covenant in the land of Damascus and yet turned backward and acted treacherously and *departed from the spring of living waters.*»

Zad. Fragm. 5 1, 3 2:

ובמחזיקי במצות אל אשר נות־רו מהם הקים אל את בריתו לישראל
עד עולם... ויחפרו באר למים רבים ומואסיהם לא יחיה.

»But with them that held fast by the commandments of God [who were left of them] God confirmed the covenant of Israel for ever . . . and they digged a *well of many waters:* and he that despises them *shall not live.*»

---

[1] Schechter, *Fragm. Jew. Sect.* i, p. 19 ll. 32—34, Charles, *Ap.* and *Pseudep.* ii, p. 820.

[2] Schechter, *Fragm. Jew. Sect.* i, p. 3 ll. 12 f., 16 f., Charles, *Ap. and Pseudep.* ii, p. 806.

Zad. Fragm. 8 3—10[1]:

ויזכר אל ברית ראשונים ויקם מאהרן נבונים ומישראל חכמים וישמעם
ויחפרו את הבאר באר חפרוה שרים כרוה נדיבי העם במחוקק
הבאר היא התורה וחופריה הם שבי ישראל היוצאים מארץ יהודה
ויגורו בארץ דמשק אשר קרא אל את כולם שרים כי דרשוהו ולא
הושבה פארתם בפי אחד והמחוקק הוא דורש התורה אשר אמר
ישעיה מוציא כלי למעשיהו ונדיבי העם הם הבאים לכרות את הבאר
במחוקקות אשר חקק המחוקק להתהלך במה בכל קץ הרשיע וזולתם
לא ישיגו עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים.

»But God remembered the *covenant* with the forefathers: and he raised up from Aaron men of *understanding*, and from Israel wise men: and he made them to hearken and they digged the *well*. 'A well the princes digged, the nobles of the people delved it by the order of the law giver (*Num* 21 18).' *The well is the Tora* and they who digged it are the captivity of Israel who went forth out of the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus, all of whom God called princes. For they sought him and their bough was not turned back in the mouth of one. And the Lawgiver is he who interprets the Law, concerning whom Isaiah said: 'He bringeth forth an instrument for his work (*Isa* 54 16)'. And the nobles of the people are those who came to dig the well, by the precepts in the which the Lawgiver ordained that they should walk throughout the full period of the wicked[ness]. And save them they shall get nothing until there arises the *Teacher of Righteousness* in the end of the days.»

The same complex — wisdom—knowledge—Tora — in connexion with the symbol of water is found in *Sir.* 15 1—3 (»How Wisdom is to be attained.») 1. ὁ φοβούμενος κύριον ποιήσει αὐτό, καὶ ὁ ἐγκρατὴς τοῦ νόμου καταλήμψεται αὐτήν. 2. καὶ ὑπαντήσεται αὐτῷ ὡς μήτηρ, καὶ ὡς γυνὴ παρθενείας προσδέξεται αὐτόν· 3. ψωμιεῖ αὐτὸν ἄρτον συνέσεως, καὶ ὕδωρ σοφίας ποτίσει αὐτόν. »For he that feareth the Lord doeth this (*scil.* meditates on Wisdom, etc. as set forth in *Sir.* 14 20—27), and he that *taketh hold of the Law findeth her.* And she will meet him as a mother, and as a youthful wife will she receive him; and *she will feed him with the bread of understanding,* and will *give him the water of knowledge to drink.*» Cf. the '*bread* of life' in Jn 6 35 ff. closely related to the '*water*' of life.

---

[1] Schechter, *op. cit.* ii, p. 6, Charles, *op. cit.* ii, p. 812.

In *Wisdom of Sol.* 7 25: σοφία is called: ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής, »a clear effluence of the glory of the Almighty».

It is well-known that the symbolism of the 'fountain' and the 'water' plays an important rôle in the *Odes of Salomon*.[1]: *Od. Sol.* VI[2]. »8. For there went forth a stream and became a river great and broad: it swept away everything, and broke up and carried away[3] the Temple. 9. And the restraints [made] by men were not able to restrain it, nor the arts of those whose [business it is to] restrain water. 10. For it spread over the face of the whole earth, and it filled everything. 11. *All the thirsty upon earth were given to drink* [of it]: *all thirst was done away and quenched:* 12. For from the Most High the draught was given. 13. Blessed then are the ministers of that draught, who have been entrusted with that water of His: 14. They have assuaged the dry lips, and the will that had fainted they have raised up: 15. And *souls that were near departing they have held back from death:* 16. And limbs that had fallen they have straightened and set up: 17. They gave strength to their coming and light to their eyes. 18. For every one knew them in the Lord, and *they lived by the water an eternal life* (ܘܚܝܘ ܒܡܝ̈ܐ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܠܥܠܡ).»

Od. Sol. XI »5. And I was established upon the rock of *truth,* where he had set me up. 6. And speaking *waters* (ܡܝ̈ܐ ܡ̈ܠܠܐ) drew near my lips from the *fountain of the Lord* (ܡܒܘܥܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ) plenteously. 7. And I *drank* and was inebriated with *living water* that *doth not die* (ܡܝ̈ܐ ܚܝ̈ܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܝܬܝܢ) and my inebriation was not one without knowledge, but I forsook vanity and turned to the Most High my God. 14. My eyes were enlightened, and my face received the dew (ܛܠܐ).»

Od. Sol. XXX[4] »1. Fill ye water for yourselves from the *living fountain of the Lord* (ܡܒܘܥܐ ܚܝܐ ܕܡܪܝܐ) for it has been opened to you: 2. And come all ye *Thirsty* and take a draught; and *rest by the fountain of the Lord.* 3. For fair it is and pure; and it gives *rest* to the soul. 4. Much sweeter is its water than honey;

---

[1] *Vide* G. Bert, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* pp. 85, 86: »das Wasser als Bild der erquickenden, der belebenden Kraft der Wahrheit des Wortes».

[2] R. Harris *Od. and Ps. of Sol.* ii p. 233 (i pp. 12, 13).

[3] Another rendering: 'and brought (everything) to'. Cf. R. Harris, *op. cit.* ii p. 234, J. H. Bernard, *The Odes of Solomon* pp. 55, 57.

[4] Rendel Harris, *Od. and Ps. of Sol.* i p. 73, ii p. 366.

and the honeycomb of bees is not to be compared with it. 5. For it *flows from* the lips of *the Lord,* and *from the heart of the Lord* is its name. 6. And it came *unlimited* and invisible; and *until it was set in the midst they did not know it.* 7. Blessed are they who have *drunk* therefrom; and rested thereby.»

(R. Harris says: »It is abundantly clear that the flowing stream of which the Ode speaks is the knowledge of the Lord, as it has been equally recognized in Ode vi».)

The emphasis on 'rest' in this ode deserves notice. It might not be too far-fetched to compare the allusion in Jn 4^{6} to the giving rest to the wearied as one of the functions of the true well.

Od. Sol. XXVIII »15. . . . I was carrying water in my right hand, and their bitterness I endured by my sweetness.» The possession of the 'water' expresses the consciousness of peace and of being guarded which is enjoyed by him who has attained to communion with the eternal life. Cf. Jn 14^{27} 16^{33}.

As regards the symbolical use of 'water' in Rabbinical literature to be taken into account in relation to Jn 4, Billerbeck *ad* 4^{10} is exhaustive. He points out that the Rabbinic teachers seldom explained in an allegorical, symbolical sense the expression מים חיים (living water) occurring in OT. On the other hand, מים (water) alone frequently received an allegorical interpretation, sometimes being referred to the *Holy Spirit,* most often to the *Tora.*

The *Hªlākoþ* contained in the third book of the Tora are likened unto living water acc. to *Gen R* 64_{7}.[1] The words of the Tora are like a well of living water, acc. to *Targ.* on *Cant* 4^{15}, *Cant R* 4_{30}.[2]

With reference to the House of Libation (בית השואבה, lit., house of drawing *scil.* of water) R. Yᵉhošuaʿ b. Leu̯i says: it is called thus, because from there they drew the Holy Spirit (*TY Sukkā* 55 a, *Gen R* 70_{8}, *Pᵉsiq. R* 1). *Gen* 29^{2}: 'for out of that well they watered the flocks' is an allusion to the drawing of the Holy Spirit acc. to R. Hama bar Hᵃnina (*Gen R* 70_{8}). The OT simile of the outpouring of water for the outpouring of the Spirit are retained in the Rabbinic interpretations, *e.g. Targ* to *Isa* 44^{3}.

---

[1] »Gen 16^{19}: 'And Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water', refers to the third book of the Tora, Leviticus, because this book is full of great Hªlākoþ» וימצאו שם באר מים חיים כנגד ס' ויקרא שהוא מלא הלכות רבות

[2] א"ר יוחנן מ"ה פעמים כתוב בתורה באר באר כנגד מ"ח דברים שנתנה בם התורה [cf. *Pirqe 'Aƀōþ., Pæræq R. Me'ir,* 6_{6} ff.] הה"ד מעין גנים באר מים חיים ונוזלים מן לבנון

The manner in which water is used symbolically for the *Tora* forms an important parallel to ideas in Jn 4. Classical is the passage in *Sifre,* pārāšā *ʿEqæb*, 37 c d[1]:

נמשלו דברי תורה למים מה מים חיים לעולם אף דברי תורה
חיים לעולם שנאמר כי חיים הם למוצאיהם ולכל בשרו מרפא ומה
מים מעלים את הטמא מטומאתו כך דברי תורה מעלים את האדם
מדרך רעה לדרך טובה שנאמר תורת ה' תמימה משיבת נפש ומה
מים חנם לעולם אף דברי תורה חנם לעולם שנאמר הוי כל צמא
לכו למים ומה מים שאין להם דמים אף דברי תורה אין להם דמים
שנ' יקרה היא מפנינים וכל חפצים לא ישוו בה או מה מים אין
משמחים לבו של אדם אף דברי תורה אין משמחים תלמוד לו״ כי
טובים דודיך מיין

»The words of the Tora are likened unto water. Just as water (is) life to the world, so the words of the Tora are life to the world, as it is written (*Prov.* 4^{22}): 'For they (my words) are life unto those that find them and health to all their flesh'. And just as water brings the unclean out of his impurity[2], so the words of the Tora bring man from the evil way to the good way, as it is written (*Ps* 19^{7}): »The Tora of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul (*i.e.* causing it to turn into the good way). Just as water (is given) freely to the world so the words of the Tora (are given) freely to the world, as it written (*Isa* 55^{1}): »Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, [and he that hath no money, come ye, buy, and eat, yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price]. Just as water is priceless so the words of the Tora are priceless. And just as [one may say:] does not water make the heart of man glad, so [one may say:] do not the words of the Tora make [the heart] glad? The scripture says (*Cant* 1^{2}): 'for thy love is better than wine'.»

---

[1] Translated Billerbeck, ii p. 435.

[2] Here should perhaps be inserted with *Yalq ha-mMāk.*, *Ps* 19^{26} and *Isa* 55^{1}, *Midraš Tannāʾim*, p. 42: »so the words of the Tora bring the unclean out of their impurity; as it is written (*Ps* 119^{140}): 'Thy word is very pure. Just as water makes man's soul return (*i.e.* restores, refreshes it), as it is written (*Prov.* 25^{25}): 'As cold waters to a thirsty soul', so the words of the Tora make man's soul return, etc.»

Another feature appears in *TB Ta'ᵃniþ* 7ᵃ [1]

אמר ר׳ חנינא בר אידי למה נמשלו דברי תורה למים דכ׳ הוי כל צמא לכו למים לומר לך מה מים מניחין מקום גבוה והולך למקום נמוך אף דברי תורה אין מתקיימין אלא במי שדעתו שפלה

»R. Ḥᵃnina bar 'Iđi said: 'Why are the words of the Tora likened unto water, as it is written (*Isa* 55 1): 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters!' [Answer:] In order to teach you that just as the water leaves a high place and goes to a low place so the words of the Tora remain only with one whose mind is low (humble)», *i.e.* one who does not compare himself with, or fix his attention on, those below him, but fixes his attention on what is above him, viz. the Holy one, and recognizes that the Tora is a gift from on high.

Since 'water' in general, or in its good sense, symbolises the true teaching, knowledge, wisdom, which is the Tora, false doctrine may be symbolized by 'evil water' or 'other water'. To the passages quoted by Billerbeck the following may be added:

ר׳ שמעון בן יוחאי אומר שתה מים מבורך שתה ממים שבבורך ואל תשתה עכורים ותמשך עם דברי מינים

»R. Šimʿon bæn Yoḥai said: 'Drink waters out of thine own cistern [and running waters out of thine own well] (*Prov* 5 15): 'that is, drink of the waters that are in thy cistern and do not drink impure waters and be attracted by the words of the Minim.» The original[2] meaning of this dictum is, no doubt, that a man cannot receive the truth, or the right doctrine, unless he have received the Light from within, unless he have a well of living water within him.

There is a variant, or an addition, to this passage, recorded in *Miđraš Tannā'im* p. 42[3]

ר׳ שמעון בן מנסיא אומר שתה מים מבורך שתה ממים של בוראך

»R. Šimʿōn bæn Mᵉnasya said: 'Drink waters out of thine own cistern *(bōrækā)*': that is, — drink of the waters of thy Creator *(bōrᵉ'ækā)*.»

---

[1] Translated Billerbeck, ii p. 435.

[2] It has been interpreted as meaning: 'drink of the water that is with thee in thy town, i.e. go first to the teacher of thy native place, then you may study anywhere you like'.

[3] Cf. Friedmann's *Sifre*, *pisqā* 48.

Cant R. 1 7

א"ר חנינא [משל] לבאר עמוקה מלאה מים [והיו מימיה] צוננין
מתוקים וטובים ולא היתה בריה יכולה לשתות ממנה בא אדם אחד
[וקשר] (וספק לה) חבל בחבל [נימה בנימה] משיחה במשיחה ודלה
ממנה [ודלה ושתה] התחילו הכל דולין ושותין כך מדבר לדבר
ממשל למשל עמד שלמה על סודה של תורה דכתיב משלי שלמה
בן דוד מלך ישראל [ע"י משלותיו של שלמה עמד על דברי תורה]

»R. Hªnina said; there is a likeness: a well, deep and containing water cool and sweet and good, and no creature was able to drink out of it [until there] came a man who knitted rope to rope and cord to cord and drew (water) from it, and then everybody began to draw and drink. So [it is with the Tora, which is also likened to a well:] from word to word, and from likeness to likeness Solomon [proceeded and was able to] stand upon (*i.e.* to reveal) the secret of the Tora as it is written: 'the similitudes of Solomon, the king of Israel' (*Prov.* 1^1) [for through his similitudes Solomon stood upon the words of the Tora].»

Yalq, ii § 480 *(Pᵉsiq R)*

מה המים נתונים מלמעלה אף דברי תורה נתנים מלמעלה מן השמים
דברתי עמכם... מה המים יורדים טיפים ונעשים נחלים כך
ד"ת שתי הלכות היום ושתי הלכות למחר עד שנעשה כמעין נובע

»Just as the waters are *given from above* so the *words of the Tora are given from above,* [as it is written, *Exod.* 20] 'From heaven I did talk with you'... Just as the waters descend in drops and are made into numerous rivers, so the words of the Tora, (are received) 'two Hªlākoþ to-day and two Hªlākoþ to-morrow', until it (the Tora) becomes like a *springing fountain.*» (Cf. Jn 4^{17}.)

With regard to the Mandaitic use of the term 'water' it was shown above, pp. 55—58, that 'water of Life' or 'living water' symbolises the engendering effluence from the Spiritual World, the House of Life. Some other instances of the use of 'water' and 'living water' may be adduced here.

The Great King of Light is the 'Sender of the living water'.[1] An 'olive rod' of living water is given to the Messenger by the Father, the Life[2], and the Messenger in his turn gives to the faithful 'swords' and 'spears' of living water[1], with which to overcome the inimical powers of the lower world. The demiurg receives 'water and living fire' from the Father, in order to be able to create a world of his own[2], the 'water' being thought of not as a mere cosmical element but as the principle of creative life emanating from the source of Life. The Life 'creates a son and puts him in the Jordan of Living Water that came from the Life'.[3] From the original Light the great Jordan of Living Water is poured out upon the First world, and from this living water a second Jordan emanates and is poured out upon the second World.[4] From the Living Water of the Jordans the beings of the world in question arise.[5]

---

[1] *GR II 2* 56^{27} (*Pet* $63^{7,8}$) מִשאדראנון דָמיא הייא

[2] *GR IV 1* $83^{1,2}$ (*Pet* $82^{20,21}$) מארגנא דָמיא הייא דָאבאהאתאי עְהאבליא

The assimilation or reception of the water of life is naturally expressed as a 'drinking'. 'Of that water you shall drink when thirsty'[6]; »the efflux from the Living Water on Tibil will serve thee as water».

The term '*fountain*' or '*well*' of life is frequent. This term is connected with the conception of the right faith or teaching: the '*doctrine* of Life'.[7] Important as a parallel to Jn 3 14 is the passage: 'This is the fountain of life which sprang up from the place of Life, that we might drink of this fountain of life'.[1] In this passage the fountain of life is identified with the Messenger: »the Good one, the Founder of the Original Secret, the Life that arose from the Life, the Kušṭa that was from the beginning in the beginning».[2] In another passage the believers praise the Son, the Messenger, for the life and the teaching given them from the Life, saying: »Thou didst descend and made us dwell by the fountains of life. Thou pouredst out into us and filled us with thy Wisdom, thy Knowledge and thy Goodness. Thou shewedst us the way on which thou camest from the House of Life».[3] In Mandaitic, thus, whatever secondary symbolical connotations may inhere in the term, »living water»[4] primarily denotes the efflux of life from the World of Life into the lower world. Hence it is quite natural that the 'living water' is identified with the upper water of *Gen* 1 (cf. above pp. 55—58), and put in iuxtaposition to *Light*, *Living Fire*, *Spirit* and *Mana*.[5]

---

[1] *GR XV 6* $319^{17,19}$. (*Pet* $316^{12,14}$) עצטמומיא, סיפיא ד̅מיא הייא.

[2] *GR X*, 241^{18} (*Pet* $239^{23,24}$).

[3] *GR X*, $240^{34,35}$ (*Pet* 239^{8-10})

האילאך קרא ברא ושאויא צאותא לנאפשה ואקמה̅ ביארדנא דמיא הייא דמן הייא הון

[4] *GR III* 69^{7-26} (*Pet* 69, 70).

[5] *ib.* and *GR IX 2* 235 (*Pet* 234^{15-23})

האזין הוא ראזא וסידרא דזיוא דיאקיד בגו מאנא ד̅מינה הון שאמביביא דזיוא ומינה̅ הון יארדניא גאואייא ומינאיהון (ו)מן האנאתון יארדניא הוא יארדנא ראב בולהון יארדניא מן האנאתה יארדנא פירשאת וניפקאת ניטובתא ראבתיא כאסיתא קאדמאיתא . . . ד̅מינה̅ הוא להודאיא ברא ואדיקא ד̅מינה̅ הון בניא פרישאייא ה̅הייא קאדמאייא דקאימיא בתושביהתא סאגדיא ומשאביא להאך מאנא רבא כאבירא

[6] *GR III* 89, 92

[7] *GR X* 240^{9-12} (*Pet* 238^{11-15})

קאיים הייא נאפשאיהון בגו מאמבוגיא דמיא ד̅מינאיהון דילון עשתפון . . . ועתיב בזיואיהון שום שותא האיתא ד̅עתלאבאשבה̅

»The Life placed itself in the midst of the fountains of water that were poured out from it; and in its splendour dwelled (*lit:* sat) the name of the living doctrine (*or:* words, speech), in which it clad itself.»

---

[1] *MLi* $77^{1,2}$ (*Qolastā* 45)

האזין הו מאמבוהא דהייא דנבא מן אתרא דהייא דנישתיא מינה מן האזין מאמבוגא דהייא

Notice the word נבא, corresponding to the Hebrew נבע (cf. above p. 160 l. 19) which corresponds to the Greek ἅλλομαι (LXX *Pr* 18^4: ἀναπηδύε).

[2] *MLi* $76^{9,10}$ 77^1 (*Qolastā* 45)

טאבא שאבין ראזא קאדמאיא הייא דהון מן הייא וכושטא דהוא מן קודאם ברישא

[3] *MLi* 38^{2-4} (*Qolastā* 24)

נהיתת ושבאנתינאן במאמבוגיא דהייא שפאכת ומליתינאן מן היכומתאך ומן סיברותאך ומן טאבותאך האויתינאן עוהרא דאנאת עתיתבה מן בית הייא

Cf. *GL III 36* $564^{24,25}$ (*Pet* 116^{17})

כאהו יארדנא דמיא הייא דמינה ואכותא ניסבית מינה »where is the Jordan of Living Water from which I took (received) victory?»

In *MLi* there occur references to several fountains of life or fountains of light, e.g. three fountains *MLi* 148, three fountains and seven fountains *MLi* 265.

[4] Also the expression »white water» occurs, but this is probably later, and evolved as an antithesis to the »black water» (*GR* 12^{16} 32^{33}).

[5] *M Joh XIII*, 56^{15-20} (*T* 51^{11-15})

אתינון למיא הייא ורמונון במיא תאהמיא אתיויא לנהורא דנאהור ורימיויא בהשובא האשבא ... אתיויא על נורא האיתא ורימיויא בנורא אכלא אתיויא לנישימתא מאנא דאכיא ורימיויא אבפאגרא באטלא

»They brought living water and threw it into the chaotic water; they brought shining light and threw it into the dark darkness ... they brought the living fire and threw it into the consuming fire; they brought the spirit, the pure Mana, and threw it into the worthless body.»

The Living Water also in Mandæan literature has as its antithesis 'water' belonging to the realm of darkness and evil, the lower world. This latter is identified with the Lower Water or the *Tᵉhom* of *Genesis* 1^{2,7}.[1] From the Hebrew *tᵉhom* the attributive *tahem, tahma, tahme* (here translated 'chaotic' or 'of Chaos') is evolved. A synonym for 'the chaotic water' is 'the black water'. Instances of the use of these terms are already given above, pp. 55—58, 82, 128. The 'fountains of living water' have their counterpart in the 'fountains of black water'.[2] The 'fountain of black water is 'deep'.[3] For the expression 'drink of the chaotic water' cf. above p. 57; and on its significance cf. above pp. 58 ll. 2 ff., 129 n. 1.

In *GR* V 3 there is a relation of the condition of the spirits of the Christian believers, kept in the Watchhouse of Christ. This passage is important, since it shows familiarity with and dependence upon thoughts and expressions occurring in the Fourth Gospel. Thus there are allusions to Christ as the shepherd and his followers as the herd (Jn 10^{11,14}), as the giver (or, at least, promiser) of 'water' to the thirsty (Jn 4^{10,14}, 7^{31,38}), as the one, who said: 'all has been given into my hands' (Jn 3^{35}, 6^{37} *e.a.*), to the words of Jn 3^{4}, possibly also to Jn 2^{19} ('three days') and 10^{1,2,9}. The context in which these allusions occur shows, further, that the Fourth Gospel with which the Mandæans were confronted belonged to the holy scriptures of the Christian circles to which they were in opposition.[4]

---

[1] Cf. the quotation from *Lev. R* 27_{1} above pp. 140 f.

[2] *GR V*, 154^{28}, 158^{20,21}.

[3] *GR V*, 161$^{35\text{ ff.}}$

[4] *GR* 187^{1}—188^{22} (*Pet* 184^{8}—187^{18})
שאילית ואמריליא מאבאטבה̄ בהאזא מאטארתא כול מאן ד̄בהייא באפאר
ובמשיהא אודיא . . . [184^{12}] דאמיא האניך נישמאתא לאקנא דנאפשא וסאגיא
קודאם משיהא ד̄הו משיהא ליא נאסגינין ועל יאמא נאקמינין ומיא נישילונה̄
וליהיא גאדאדא דיאמא מדיליא ומיא דיאמא אמוקיא באיין מיא למישתיא
וליתלון אמרילה נישמאתא למשיהא משיהא מאראן כוי הואינין בהאנאתה̄ אלמא
לבושיא אלבישנין וכוייא כאסינין ופרוקיא פאריקנין וזידקא וטאבותא עהאבנין
האשתא אלמא באיינין מיא למישתיא וליתלאן . . . [185^{13}] אמארלה̄ נישמאתא
למשיהא משיהא מאראן כוי הואינין בהאך אלמא לאו אנאת אמארתלאן דראב
וגאביר מינאי לאיית אנא הו אלאהא אליהין מאריא מארואן אנא הוא מאלכא
דכולהון אלמיא אנא הו רישאיון דכולהון עובאדיא . . . [186^{1} 185^{24}] אמרילה
נישמאתא למשיהא משיהא מאראן אכמאר רמינאן בפאגראיאן יומיא תלאתא

Important for determining the connexions of Jn 4^5—14 are three passages from Hippolyt's description of the tenets of the

---

ניזאבוניא כול ד̄עתלאן ונינהית ליא־רדנא וניצטבא על שום האזין גאברא דארא
עלאך אמארלין מ̇שיהא ל̇נישמאתא יא כ̇שיליא דעתאכשאל כוי הואיתון
בהאנאתה אלמא מיהזאיתון יאנקא ד̄נפאק מן כראם עמה̄ ועהדאר בעמה̄
אילויא ד̄אנא עהדאר בפאגראיכון ערמינכון יומיא תלאתא.

The Spirit of the true believer, ascending after death to its celestial home, relates how it passes the various watch-houses (maṭṭarata) where the erring spirits are kept. The spirit is represented as asking and receiving informations from its guides concerning the inhabitants of each maṭṭarta. When arriving at the watchhouse of Christ, so the spirit tells, »I asked, and they said to me: 'In this watchhouse are fettered all those who deny the Life and confess Mšiha . . .' Those spirits resemble a great and numerous herd [of sheep] before Mšiha. He, Mšiha, leads them to the sea and places them [there]. They ask him [to give them] *water*, but the shore of the sea is high and the *water* of the sea is *deep* (Jn 4[10, 11]). They desire to drink water, but they get none. Then the spirits say to Mšiha: 'Mšiha, our Lord! When we were in that world we clad (the naked) with clothes, and covered them with raiments (cf. *Mt* 25[35 ff.]), we redeemed [the imprisoned], we gave alms and gifts, why, then, do we now ask for water to drink and get none'?» Mšiha answers them to the effect that they have arrived to the world of those in whose name they did all this, Ešu (Ἰησοῦς) Mšiha, the Holy Spirit, the God of the Naṣarenes and the Virgin, the Daughter of her Father (*i.e.* the Virgin Mary). After this there is in the text a relation of how Mšiha pays obeisance to the man of tested fait, *gabra bhir zidqa*, [probably = the Messenger from the Life, *i.e.* the true Son], when he passes the Maṭṭarta of Mšiha. When the spirits see this, they ask Mšiha the reason, saying: »Mšiha, our Lord, when we were in that world, didst thou not say: There is none greater and mightier than I. I am the God of the gods, the Lord of the Lords, the King of all worlds, the head of all works (Jn 5[36], 6[28] etc.; the allusion is, of course, also to current Christian representation of J).» Why, then, didst thou pay obeisance to him? Mšiha answers that the man of tested faith is superior to him, since he has not confessed the name of the beings above and below, the name of the Holy Spirit *(Ruha dQudša)*, Mšiha, the God of the Nazarenes and the Virgin. Then »the spirits say to Mšiha: 'Mšiha, our Lord, put us again into our body for three days (Jn 2), that we may sell all that we have, go down to Jordan, and be baptized in the name of that man who passed by thee!' But Mšiha answers the Spirits: 'Oh, ye stumbling ones! When you were in that world, did you ever see a child go out from its mother's womb and then made to return into its mother again, so that I could throw you again into your bodies for three days' [Jn 3[4]].» It is immediately apparent that the Jn-ine passages are travestated or turned into a sense opposite to the original, but it is no less clear, that this is intentional and studied. The remainder of the passage may here be given in Lidzbarski's translation: »Christus sprach ferner zu den Seelen: 'Wisset ihr nicht, ihr Gestrauchelten, die ihr gestrauchelt seid? Ich bin der nichtige Messias, gerieben für die Bedrängnis, weise zum Bösen, der die Pforten des Schlafes verändert, die Werke des Geistes verdreht, die frommen Männer betört und sie in die gewaltigen Nebelwolken der Finsternis wirft. Als

Naassenes, the Sethians and Justin the Gnostic respectively. It will be well to begin with the reference to Justin: Hippol., *Refut.* V 27: Ἐπειδὰν δὲ ὀμόσῃ τοῦτον τὸν ὅρκον, εἰσέρχεται πρὸς τὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ βλέπει, ὅσα ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσε καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, καὶ πίνει ἀπὸ τοῦ ζῶντος ὕδατος, ὅπερ ἐστὶ λουτρὸν αὐτοῖς, ὡς νομίζουσι, *πηγὴ ζῶντος ὕδατος ἁλλομένου*. Διακεχώρισται γάρ, φησίν, ἀνὰ μέσον ὕδατος καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ ἔστιν ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ στερεώματος τῆς πονηρᾶς κτίσεως, ἐν ᾧ λούονται οἱ χοϊκοὶ καὶ ψυχικοὶ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὕδωρ ἐστὶν ὑπεράνω τοῦ στερεώματος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζῶν, ἐν ᾧ λούονται οἱ πνευματικοὶ ξῶντες ἄνθρωποι, ἐν ᾧ ἐλούσατο Ἐλωείμ καὶ λουσάμενος οὐ μετεμελήθη.

»When he (*i.e.* the initiated) has sworn that oath he enters into the presence of the Good One and sees 'what eye hath not seen nor ear heard and it has not entered into the heart of man, (*Isa* 1^2)' and he *drinks* from the *living water* which is their font, as they think, the *well of living, springing water.* For there is a distinction, he says, between water and water; and there is the *water below the firmament* of the bad creation wherein are washed the earthly and psychical men, and there is the *living water above the firmament* of the Good One in which Elohim did bathe and having cleansed himself did not repent.»

Next comes an excerpt from the representation or quotation of the doctrines of the Sethians:

Hipp., *Refut.* V 19 Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι, φησίν, ἀρκετὸν τὸ εἰσεληλυθέναι τὸν τέλειον ἄνθρωπον, λόγον, εἰς μήτραν παρθένου καὶ λῦσαι τὰς ὠδῖνας τὰς ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ σκότει· ἀλλὰ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ [εἰς] τὰ ἐν μήτρᾳ μυστήρια μυσερὰ εἰσελθεῖν ἀπελούσατο καὶ ἔπιε τὸ ποτήριον ζῶντος ὕδατος ἁλλομένου, ὃ δεῖ πάντως πιεῖν τὸν μέλλοντα ἀποδιδύσκεσθαι τὴν δουλικὴν μορφὴν καὶ ἐπενδύσασθαι ἔνδυμα οὐράνιον.

»But it is not enough, he says, that the Perfect Man, the Word, has entered into the womb of a virgin and has loosed the pangs which were in that darkness. But in truth after entering into the foul mysteries of the womb, he was washed and *drank of the cup of living, springing water,* which he must needs drink who was about to do off the slave-like form and do on a heavenly garment.»

From the section on the Naassenes, again, the following may be cited:

---

ich euch Pflöcke und Schlüssel zeigte, betörte ich euch und machte euch gierig. Gold und Silber schenkte ich euch, damit ihr mir in der Finsternis, in jenem Orte, an dem wir stehen, Gesellschaft leistet».» It might be questioned whether there be not here a covert allusion also to Jn $10^{1,2,9}$.

Hippol. *Refut.* V 9 Ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ὁ τέταρτος Εὐφράτης. Τοῦτον λέγουσι, στόμα, δι᾽ οὗ ἡ τῆς προσευχῆς ἔξοδος καὶ ἡ τῆς τροφῆς εἴσοδος, (ἣ) [ὃς] εὐφραίνει καὶ τρέφει καὶ χαρακτηρίζει τὸν πνευματικὸν τέλειον ἄνθρωπον. Τοῦτο, φησίν, ἐστὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑπεράνω τοῦ στερεώματος, περὶ οὗ, φησίν, εἴρηκεν ὁ σωτήρ· εἰ ᾔδεις τίς ἐστιν ὁ αἰτῶν, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι πιεῖν ζῶν ὕδωρ ἁλλόμενον. Ἐπὶ τοῦτο, φησί, τὴ ὕδωρ πᾶσα φύσις [εἰσ]έρχεται τὰς ἑαυτῆς οὐσίας ἐκλέγουσα, καὶ προσέρχεται ἑκάστῃ φύσει ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου τὸ οἰκεῖον, φησί, μᾶλλον ἢ σίδηρος τῇ Ἡρακλείᾳ λίθῳ, καὶ ὁ χρυσὸς τῇ τοῦ θαλασσίου ἱέρακος κερκίδι, καὶ τὸ ἄχυρον τῷ ἠλέκτρῳ. Εἰ δέ τις, φησίν, ἐστὶ τυφλὸς ἐκ γενετῆς καὶ μὴ τεθεαμένος φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, δι᾽ ἡμῶν ἀναβλεψάτω καὶ ἰδέτω οἱονεὶ διά τινος παραδείσου παμφύτου καὶ πολυσπερμάτου ὕδωρ διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων τῶν φυτῶν καὶ τῶν σπερμάτων, καὶ ὄψεται, ὅτι ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὕδατος ἐκλέγεται καὶ ἐπισπᾶται ἡ ἐλαία τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ ἡ ἄμπελος τὸν οἶνον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κατὰ γένος ἕκαστον φυτῶν. Ἔστι δέ, φησίν, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ἄτιμος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ πολύτιμος [ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, προδεδομένος] ὑπὸ τῶν οὐκ εἰδότων τοῖς οὐκ εἰδόσιν αὐτόν, λελογισμένος ὡς σταγὼν ἀπὸ κάδου· ἡμεῖς δ᾽εσμέν, φησίν, οἱ πνευματικοί, οἱ ἐκλεγόμενοι ἀπὸ τοῦ ζῶντος ὕδατος τοῦ ῥέοντος Εὐφράτου διὰ τῆς βαβυλῶνος μέσης τὸ οἰκεῖον, διὰ τῆς πύλης ὁδεύοντες ἀληθινῆς, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ μακάριος. Καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐξ ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἡμεῖς χριστιανοὶ μόνοι . . .

»'And the fourth river is Euphrates (*Gen* 2^{14})'. This, they say, is the mouth, which is the seat of prayer and the entrance of food, which gladdens and nourishes and stamps the spiritual, perfect man. This, he says, is the *water above the firmament* concerning which, he says, the Saviour speaks: '*If thou knewest who it is that asks thou would have asked of him, and he would have given thee to drink living, springing water*'. *To* this *water*, he says, comes every nature to choose its own substances, and *from* this *water goes forth to every nature that which is proper to it*, he says, more (certainly) than iron to the magnet, gold to the spine of the sea-falcon and husks to amber. But if anyone, he says, is blind from birth, and has not beheld the *true light which lightens every man who cometh into the world* (Jn 1^{9}), let him recover his sight again through us, and behold how as it were through some Paradise full of all plants and seeds, the water flows among them. Let him see, too, that *from one and the same water* the olive-tree chooses and draws to itself oil, and the vine wine, and each of the other plants [that which is] according to its kind. But that

Man, he says, is without honour in the world, and much honoured [in heaven, being betrayed] by those *who know not to those who know him not* (Jn $1^{10,11}$), and accounted like a drop which falleth from a vessel. But we are, he says, the *spiritual who have chosen out of the living water,* the Euphrates flowing through the midst of Babylon, *that which is ours,* entering in through the *true gate* which is *Jesus the blessed* (Jn 10^{9} ...). And we alone of all men are Christians ...»

Bauer[1] refers to the former two passages from Hippol., but not the third. He deduces from the similar wording of the passages and their common difference from the Jn-ine parallel of Jn $4^{(10)14}$, that the very expression ὕδωρ ζῶν ἀλλόμενον cannot be derived from Jn 4^{14}. It may be surmised, however, that the passage quoted above from Hippolyt's description of the teachings of the Naassenes, which is there explicitly stated to be a quotation of the J-dictum as occurring in Jn 4, and yet has the similar difference of version, shows quite definitely that all three quotations are, in the last instance, derived from Jn 4. The difference in wording, again, consists simply in a contraction or commixture of Jn 4^{10} with Jn 4^{14}. Whether this variant obtained in any Jn-ine source from which the gnostic books in question drew or it was due simply to Hippolyt himself may be left as an open question. It is easily noticed that the scriptural quotations in Hippol., whether from the OT. or the NT., are seldom accurate. The fact remains that we have here to do with actual references to the discourse of Jn 4, and that the expression ἀλλόμενον ὕδωρ ζῶν goes back on Jn $4^{10,11}$.

On the other hand it is evident that the symbolical use of the term 'water' in the said Gnostic writings is not to be derived from Jn. The influence behind this symbolical use is to the greater part that of the OT., and, it may be surmised, of current mystical interpretations of the OT. Thus, it may be noticed, both the Naassenes and the Baruch-book of Justin, connect the 'living water' with the 'Upper, Celestial Water' of *Gen* 1^{7} (cf. above, p. 154, *1 En.* 17^{4} etc., and p. 57, in Mandaitic). Jn also, obviously, bases upon the current symbolism of 'water' and 'living water'. As has been shown above, this symbolism contained an abundant richness of ideas. All these different ideas may be said to be in some way or other represented in Jn 4; in reality the object of Jn $4^{7\,\text{ff.}}$ is to put the complex of religious ideas inherent in the simple symbolical terms of 'divine gift', 'living water', 'well' and 'spring' in relation to the true teaching the spiritual doctrine of J., to show what these ideas and expressions meant in the light of the doctrine of Spirit.

---

[1] *J. Ev.*² p. 65, cf. Kreyenbühl, *Ev. d. Wahrh.* ii p. 404.

The significance of 'living water' and the terms in Jn 4 connected therewith may be summed up as follows:

(1) Water is = teaching, doctrine. The water given by J as contrasted with the water drawn by the Samaritan woman symbolises the teaching of J. This teaching is 'God's gift': it emanates from God, and not from men; he who gives this teaching is the only one who can mediate such teaching directly from God, the Messiah, the Teacher of Righteousness, (εἰ ᾔδεις ... τίς ἐστιν ... Μεσσίας ... ὅταν ἔλθῃ ... ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα).

(2) The Divine gift, quā the true teaching, is, however, not restricted to the sense of knowledge, either of the Tora as the rule for and giver of a moral life or as containing deep secrets of Wisdom. In neither sense can the 'water' give man abiding satisfaction, 'quench his thirst'. Attaching to the conception of the water of Wisdom (or of Tora) as life-giving water, Jn 4 maintains that the spiritual teaching, the gift of true knowledge, mediated by J, when rightly received, becomes the source of life, and life itself.

(3) By the antithesis of the spring of living water within and the well of water without, the identity of spiritual realities are again hinted at. The teaching of J is not a teaching merely *concerning* the spiritual realities and the eternal life, but it *is* the eternal life and the spiritual reality. In the same way the receiver of this teaching obtains, not a mere knowledge *of* the things taught, but these things themselves, that is, the spiritual perception, knowledge, γνῶσις, does not consist in the acquisition of facts relating to outside objects, but in an assimilation with, a self-transformation into, the spiritual realities. Henceforth the spiritual realities abide in the knower, and the knower in them. The water becomes a fount of life in man, springing up into eternal, *i.e.* spiritual, life, or, which is the same, man has entered into eternal life.

(4) It is evident that this symbolical use of 'water' links up with the similar use of the term in Jn 3^{5}. In its deepest sense ὕδωρ is also here the symbol of the generation of spiritual life in man.

(5) Jn 4^{14} has, probably, a double meaning. The 'well of water within, springing up into eternal life' may be brought in relation to Jn 7^{38}: »he that believeth on me ... out of his belly

shall flow rivers of living water». He who has been born from above and entered the spiritual word and eternal life, he will himself be a source of eternal, spiritual life. The all-inclusiveness of the spiritual world implies that all spiritual beings partake in the eternal generation of life, ὕδωρ ἀλλόμενον εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, that proceeds from God.

It will be apparent at this point that the section on the 'true worship', Jn 4^{20-25}, is very closely related to the ideas of the discourse on the living water. The antithesis in the latter between the spring of living water within and the well of water without has in the former as its counterpart the antithesis between the worship in the spirit (within) and the worship attached to an external τόπος: οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσεκύνησαν, καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ... πίστευσόν μοι, γύναι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα, ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί. **ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε, ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε, ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν, ὃ οἴδαμεν** ... ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τούς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν· **πνεῦμα ὁ θεός καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.** At the same time it is clear that there is a strong allusion in this passage to the discourse with Nicodemus, an allusion which is emphasized not only by similarity of ideas but even by the use of identical or similar phrases and literary form: In both passages a person convinced of the Divine calling of J (3^2: ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος..., 4^{19}: θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ) puts questions to him relating to the way to true religion; in both passages J speaks of himself as a member of and a messenger from the spiritual world with the peculiar plural expression: '*we know*' (οἴδαμεν); in both passages there is a strange repetition of an essential phrase: Jn $3^{5,6,8}$, ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, Jn $4^{23,24}$ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ; both discourses point to a spiritual world as a reality, of which nobody can obtain knowledge except by becoming a spiritual being, by being »*in* the Spirit». Further, the discourse with the Samaritan woman taken as a whole in relation to the discourse with Nicodemus as a whole reveals a peculiar arrangement of the essential conceptions, or symbols, which is not without significance: Jn 3 in its former part dwells upon ὕδωρ and πνεῦμα, in its latter part upon ζωὴ αἰώνιος and ἀλήθεια, Jn 4, again, in its former part upon ὕδωρ and ζωὴ αἰώνιος, in its latter upon πνεῦμα and ἀλήθεια. This permutation of identical conceptions will be touched upon later. Here it may suffise to state that the intention in this case is simply to convey that the subject treated of in Jn 4 is the same as in Jn 3$^{3-21}$, but seen from another point of view.

The import of Jn 4$^{20-24}$ may now conveniently be summed up as follows:

(1) What constitutes a true (or perfect) worship is not its performance in a specific external place of worship, but that it is done in the 'spirit', *i.e.* in the spiritual world or in the spiritual part of man, in other words, a true worship of God can only be performed by one who has, at least, taken the first step towards the ascent into God's world.

(2) The true worship belongs to the conceptions to be classed under the heading of ἀνάβασις; hence it may be said to be another aspect of or one of the actuations of the religious experience described by the terms of ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς τὸ φῶς, πιστεύειν, γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν, ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον; hence it is characterized by the same spiritual properties as this experience. Especially is the προσκυνεῖν . . . ἐν ἀληθείᾳ to be brought in relation to ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν of Jn 3^{21}. It may be said that 'worship in (the) truth' could also have been expressed 'worship the truth', προσκυνεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν or τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν (cf. Jn 8^{32} 14^{6}, 17^{17} 7^{28} 17^{3}); ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, just as τὴν ἀλήθειαν of 3^{21}, refers to the true being of man, and this again relates to the communion with the truth, the 'only true God'. They who worship 'in truth' are 'true worshippers', ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταί. Those whose worship is not enacted in the spiritual reality worship 'what they do not know'.[1]

(3) since the whole discourse on the true worship moves altogether in the ideas of Jn 3$^{3-21}$ the antithesis ἡμεῖς v. ὑμεῖς must, as has been already hinted, be interpreted in a similar sense as 'we' and 'you' of 3^{11}, *i.e.* as corresponding to the contrast between those who have entered the spiritual existence and those who have not; 'we', thus, is = I, and those with me, those who believe in me. It cannot, without breaking the whole continuity of thought, be taken in the same sense in which it is used in the words of the Samaritan woman, so that ἡμεῖς of 4^{22} were = 'we Jews', and ὑμεῖς = 'you Samaritans'. The improbability of this latter inter-

---

[1] Cf. Grill, *Untersuchungen* i p. 204: »... Anbetung Gottes geschieht ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, wenn sie den Charakter eines mit dem wirklichen d. h. überweltlich-geistigen Wesen Gottes übereinstimmenden Verhaltens hat ...»

pretation is more apparent when one considers that J evidently opposes the Samaritan position less vehemently than the Jewish one, the Samaritan attitude being represented as one of willingness to accept the truth when once it has met them. It has to be assumed that the final words of 4^{22}, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν are additional here.[1]

---

[1] Cf. the opinions of Kreyenbühl and Bauer. Kreyenbühl, in *Ev. d. Wahrheit,* ii, pp. 410 ff., says: »Der Plural ist also ähnlich kollektivistisch gebraucht, wie 3,$_{11}$ ff. and 4,$_{48}$ . . . wer glaubt, der geschichtliche Jesus habe . . . den Samaritern den Vorwurf gemacht, sie hätten keine wahre Verehrung Gottes (*scil.* in contrast to the Jews), während sie der lukanische Christus (10,$_{30-37}$ und v. 7,$_{11-19}$) 'als den Vollblutisraeliten religiös und sittlich überlegen darstellt', wer der Ansicht ist, Jesus habe das Wort sprechen können: ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν, nachdem er eben die Anbetung Gottes in Jerusalem feierlich abrogiert und eine neue Form der Gottesverehrung verkündet hatte, wer Jesus mit den Juden sich den Samaritern gegenüber in seinem religiösen Bewusstsein zusammenfassen lässt, nachdem er (im Evangelium) soeben Juden und Samariter seinem eigenen religiösen Bewusstsein gegenüberstellt und in der wirklichen Geschichte gegen das religiöse Bewusstsein des offiziellen Judentums einen unablässigen Kampf auf Leben und Tod geführt hat, wer in 'Geist und Wahrheit' nicht die solenne Ausdrucksweise des Evangelisten wiederzufinden vermag: der zeigt damit nur, dass er auf ein geschichtliches Verständnis unseres Abschnittes zu verzichten entschlossen ist. Erste Bedingung dieses Verständnisses ist, dass wir . . . in dem Zusatze ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία κτλ. eine der abgeschmacktesten und unmöglichsten Glossen erkennen, die jemals einen echten Text nicht nur entstellt, sondern in sein gerades Gegenteil verkehrt haben. Weder der unmittelbare Zusammenhang, der Jerusalem und Garizim in gleicher Weise verwirft und ein Neues proklamiert, noch das geschichtliche Verhältnis des Evangeliums zum Judentum, das in der früheren Polemik dargelegt worden ist, noch endlich der besondere Sinn, den der Verfasser im ganzen Evangelium mit dem Ausdrucke Ἰουδαῖοι verbindet und der überall das Gegenteil des Heiles und der Wahrheit und der Gotteserkenntnis bedeutet, gestatten auch nur einen Augenblick an die Echtheit der Glosse zu denken. Sie hat ihren Ursprung im Bewusstsein eines Lesers, der den Gegensatz von Juden und Samaritern im geschichtlichen Sinne ins Auge gefasst, diesem aber, unter Nichtbeachtung des Zusammenhanges, den nur auf die Verschiedenheit der Gotteserkenntnis und Gottesverehrung geht, die spezifisch christliche Wendung gegeben hat, dass der Vorzug des Judentums darin liege, der Welt den σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, also das 'Heil, geschenkt zu haben.»

Bauer, *J. Ev.*^{2} pp. 66: »Da das ὑμεῖς zu Beginn von 22 nach dem Schluss von 21 die jerusalemischen Gottesanbeter nicht weniger umfasst, wie die von Garizim, wird von ihnen beiden gesagt, dass sie nicht wüssten, was sie verehrten (vgl. Act 17$_{23}$); . . . Dann aber ist die Begründung 22^b schlechthin unverständlich . . . Wir wären weit eher auf eine Motivierung gefasst, die etwa im Stile von 3$_{10}$ f. sagen würde: weil wir Einblick in die himmlischen Geheimnisse getan haben. Der hier den Juden zugebilligte Vorrang passt weder in den engeren Zusammenhang, noch überhaupt zu der gesamten Einstellung des Evangelisten . . . Schwerlich wirkt hier ein Einfluss des Paulus nach (Rm 1$_{16}$ 2$_{10}$ 3$_1$

(5) The worship in spirit and truth is founded upon the idea: God is spirit. With this the nature of God has been identified with the nature of the true, the spiritual essence of man. This is a cardinal conception of all mystic thought, perhaps nowhere expressed so simply and clearly as in Jn 4. The idea can be traced in some form or other in Rabbinic Jewish mystical dicta[1], in Mandæan literature[2], in Hermetism[3], in Gnosticism.

$9_{4,5}$). Eher möchte man glauben, dass die Urform einer von Jo in seinem Sinne bearbeiteten Geschichte, in der sich Jesus vom jüdischen Standpunkt mit den Samaritern auseinandersetzt durchbricht.» It may be surmised, that the addition is most easily understood as a gloss by one who taking the ὑμεῖς — ἡμεῖς as necessarily equivalent to the Jews — the Samaritans, tried to explain what was to him a difficulty, *viz.* that J could include the Jews with himself as 'we (who) know what we worship'. For arguments for the authenticity of the phrase cf. esp. Wendt, J *Ev* pp. 77 f., 175, Loisy, *Le Quatrième Év.*² p. 184: »Parce que le salut vient des Juifs». — »Le salut doit venir d'eux, puis que le Christ doit paraître chez eux (cf. Rom. III, 1—2; IX 4—5). Ici le Logos. — Christ n'en parle pas moins des Juifs comme s'il n'était pas réellement l'un d'eux et ne se trouvait parmis eux que pour réaliser le salut à l'endroit d'où il doit se répandre dans le monde».

[1] Reference may be made to the exhaustive treatment by J. Abelson in *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature* and especially to the Rabbinic idea of the correspondence between the *Nᵉšāmā* (spirit) soul in man and God quoted by Billerbeck ii p. 437 f.: (*Lev. R* 4_8, *TB Ber* 10 a, *Tanḥ.*, *Ḥayye Sārā*, *Deut. R.* 2). This is also, in the quoted passage, connected with worship of God:

וכי מה ראה דוד להיות מקלס בנפשו להקב"ה אלא אמר הנפש הזו ממלאה
את הגוף והקב"ה ממלא את עולמו שנא' הלא את השמים ואת הארץ וגו' תבא
הנפש שהיא ממלאה את הגוף ותשבח להקב"ה שהוא ממלא את כל העולם

»What reason had David for praising the Holy One in his *soul* (*Ps* 103^1)? Answer: he said: this (my) soul fills the body and the Holy One fills his world, as it is written (Jer. 23^{24}): do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord: Hence, may the soul that fills the body come and praise the Holy One, who fills the whole world.» ('To fill' here = to be the inner, spiritual reality, or essence of!) Cf. the sequel of the passage.

With this might be compared *TB Ber.* 11 a:

מה הקב"ה טהור אף נשמה טהורה

»Just as the Holy One is pure, so the Spirit, *(nᵉšāmā)*, is pure.»

and *TB Niddā* 30 a (*Eccl. R.* 12_7, *TB Šab* 32 b, *Bāƀā Bāpᵉrā* 16 a):

הולד קודם שיצא לאויר העולם אומרים לו: הוי יורע שהקב"ה טהור ומשרתיו
טהורים ונשמה שנתן בך טהודה היא אם אתה משמרה בטהרה מוטב ואם
לאו הריני נוטלה ממך

»Immediately before a child goes out into the ether of the world (*i.e.* is born into physical existence) they (*i.e.* God) say to it: know that the Holy One

(6) The *ἀνάβασις* of the worship is met by a *κατάβασις*: ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν (Jn 4^{23}); the expression is a counterpart to Jn 3^{16}: οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον . . .

The third aspect of the dialogue with the Samaritan woman besides the discourse on the living water and on the true worship is the controversial or antithetical attitude to the religious party represented by the Samaritan woman. This needs some consideration. It might be apposite, then, to reproduce the features relevant to the characteristics of this religious party.

It is connected with Samaria, and there with the well of Jacob, said to be near the town of Sychar, and the 'parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph'. Jacob's well is deep, and he who wants to obtain water from it must have something to draw with; but the water satisfies only temporally, does not quench the thirst permanently; through repeated reference to the 'fathers' (Jacob, Josef, οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, 4$^{5, 6, 12, 20}$) it is emphasized that the party venerates, and loyally adheres to, an old tradition; the Samaritan woman is familiar with the conception of the 'Divine Gifts', 'prophets', the

---

is pure and his servants (*i.e.* the angels) are pure and the spirit that is given thee is pure; if thou keep it in its purity, it will be good (for thee), but if not, lo, I will take it away from thee.»

It should also be noted that the conscious spiritual state, enjoyed by man before his fall, and which may be attained by eminently righteous men, corresponds approximately (as was mentioned above on Jn 3^{13}) to the spiritual state into which man is born from above and also to the spirit in which a true worship may be done. This spirit, in particular, belongs to the Divine world, is מִשֶּׁל הקב"ה, *(P. R. 'El.* 3^{4}), *lit.* 'from God's', *i.e.* of God, of his nature or essence.»

[2] That which in Mandæan literature corresponds to the πνεῦμα of Jn 3^{24} is '*mānā*'. This is used both of the Highest Being, the Deity, in which use in exactly expresses the notion: 'God is Spirit', and of the spiritual beings emanating from the Deity as also, in a specific sense, of the spirit in man; cf. above p. 81 ll. 3, 24, p. 85 f. and *GR III* 65$^{30\text{ ff.}}$ (*Pet* 68$^{23\text{ ff.}}$), and the stereotype inceptive formula of the hymns of *GL II:* »I am a Mana from the Great Life, a Mana from the mighty Life».

[3] The received text of *Corp Herm XVIII* 3 has: ἀκάματον μὲν ἐστι πνεῦμα ὁ θεός (cf. Scott, *Hermetica* i p. 274 ii p. 468, Heinrici, *Die Hermes-Mystik etc.* p. 76). But what really best corresponds to the 'spirit' of Jn 4 is, of course, the νοῦς, (cf. J. Kroll, *Lehren d. Hermes Trism.* pp. 257 f., 61 f. and E. Carpenter, *J Wr,* p. 342 n. 2: »that God was Mind (νοῦς) had been the higher religious faith since the days of Anaxagoras; the Latin moralist sang, 'If God is mind (animus) as the hymns aver' (*Catonis Distich.;* Plac. i 7,33 (Dox. 305); and the Stoics definitely affirmed that 'God is spirit pervading the whole world'» (cf. the Rabbinic: 'God fills the whole world as the *n^{e}šāmā,* (spirit), the body', above). Cf. references by Bauer, *J. Ev.*^{2} p. 68.

'Messiah who is called Christos', who is also the Teacher of Wisdom; there is a marked receptivity among the party in question for the teaching of J; J is recognized by many as the Messiah, the Saviour of the World. To the features relating to the controversial attitude should, probably, be reckoned also the reference to the husbands of the Samaritan woman in vv. 17, 18.

The most important attempt at discovering the precise circle of which the Samaritan woman is the representative is made by Kreyenbühl.[1] He finds in Jn 4 1—42 an 'Auseinandersetzung mit der jüdisch-häretischen Gnosis», a refutation of the Jewish Gnosticism through the Christian Gnosticism, the latter represented by Menander (acc. to Kreyenbühl the author of the Fourth Gospel). The Jewish Gnosticism referred to is the doctrine preserved in the λαλιὰ προφητικὴ διὰ Βαρούχ, the Baruch-book quoted by Hippolyt in his description of the tenets of the Gnostic Justin[2], and the Baruch-book itself is alluded to. The features of the discourse with the Samaritan woman are, from this point of view, to be interpreted as follows.

(1) J asks the Samaritan woman to give him water: the author puts himself, 'not without irony' in the position of a disciple, he takes knowledge of the Jewish-heretical Gnosis, not in order to be taught by it but in order to lead its adherents to the universal salvation revealed in Christ. (2) The Samaritan woman is astonished that J, being a Jew, asks a Samaritan and a woman for water: »Die Frage der Samariterin ist der Ausdruck der Verwunderung, aber auch zugleich der Befriedigung darüber, dass der Verfasser, der schriftstellerischen Einkleidung gemäss als Jude, d. h. als Angehöriger der christlichen Kirche, bezeichnet, Kenntnis nimmt von der 'tiefen Weisheit' der jüdisch-häretischen Gnosis, der γνωστικοὶ κατ' ἐξοχήν».[3] (3) Jn 4 10, J's answer, pointing to himself as the mediator of the Divine gift of living water: 'I have, so the author wants to say, taken knowledge of the wisdom of these Ophites, Naassenes and other widely ramified γνωστικοί, especially also of the secret doctrine of Justin in his λαλιαὶ προφητικαί, but against that gnosticism I put my own religious insight as the true δωρεὰ τοῦ θεοῦ and offer its adherents the real living water, which they (falsely) imagine that they possess in their knowledge of the 'Good' as a πηγὴ ζῶντος ὕδατος ἁλλομένου (Hippol., *Refut. V* 27, cf. above

---

[1] *Ev. d. Wahrheit,* ii, pp. 392—433.

[2] *Refut. V* 23—28.

[3] Kreyenbühl, *a. a. O.* ii p. 404.

p. 165). (4) Jn $4^{11, 12}$: the Jewish-heretic Gnosis says: you have nothing to draw with, that is, you lack the special intelligence of the gnostics; our well is deep: that is, our wisdom is deep, and its depth cannot be grasped save by the gnostic; it is Jacob's well: that is, the gnosis is drawn from Jewish religious sources.[1] (5) Jn $4^{13, 14}$: the gnostic wisdom cannot quench men's thirst after knowledge, nor satisfy their religious need. The only water that satisfies is that which springs up into eternal life, that is, the contents of which is eternal life. (6) Jn 4^{15}: the Samaritan woman's demand for living water is not intended to picture her disability to comprehend celestial things, nor that she misinterprets J's words in a literal, physical, sense; rather does it express »eine gewisse Wissbegier nach der höheren Weisheit und die Geneigtheit der jüdischen Gnosis, sich mit dem Inhalt der christlichen Heilslehre, wie Menandros sie versteht, näher bekannt zu machen». The Jewish-heretical gnosis descends from its high position and desires to make acquaintance with the doctrine of eternal life. (7) Jn $4^{16, 17}$: starting from the symbolical use of the relation between husband and wife for the relation between God and his people, the author with the words 'call thy husband' requires his opponents to give account for their conception of God, thereby maintaining that the decisive question is the right conception and the true worship of

---

[1] Kreyenbühl, *a. a. O.* ii p. 405: »'Der Brunnen ist tief', denn er ist die πηγὴ ζῶντος ὕδατος ἁλλομένου, die Erkenntnis des höchsten Gottes, in welcher der Eingeweihte sich über die schlechte Schöpfung Elohims und Edems erhebt und mit Elohim zum höchsten Gotte eingeht und schaut, was kein Auge gesehen und kein Ohr gehört und in keines Menschen Herz gestiegen ist (Hippol., *Refut. V* 27). Darum erklärten diese Gnostiker, dass sie allein die Tiefen erkennen (Hippol., *Refut. V* 6: ἐπεκάλεσαν ἑαυτοὺς γνωστικούς, φάσκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη γινώσκειν. *V* 8: οὕτως ἐστὶ πάνυ βαθεῖα καὶ δυσκατάληπτος ἡ τοῦ τελείου ἀνθρώπου γνῶσις. [Of the Naassenes: »Afterwards they called themselves Gnostics alleging that they alone knew the depths». »Thus ... the knowledge of the Perfect Man is very deep and hard to understand» F. Legge, pp. 120, 138] ...). Durch den 'Brunnen Jakobs' ist die Gnosis als jüdische bezeichnet, d. h. als eine solche, die aus jüdischen Religionsquellen schöpft. In der Tat ist das Baruchbuch Justins eine allegorische Deutung der mosaischen Schöpfungsgeschichte, die mit Engel-Genealogien, hellenischen Mythen und Bruchstücken des Christentums als der Vollendung alttestamentlicher Prophetie durchsetzt ist. Diese jüdischen Gnostiker alle haben ihre 'tiefe Weisheit' irgendwie in den Büchern Moses gesucht und gefunden. Moses und die Patriarchen gehören aber als die Stammväter Israels zusammen und der ganzen Einkleidung der Szene gemäss (vgl. v. 5 und 6) konnte der Brunnen nicht anders, denn als Brunnen Jakobs bezeichnet werden.»

God as the centre of religious life.[1] The Jewish heretic Gnosis, again, avers, that it has no real God ('I have no husband'). With this the author links up, and, pointing to the polytheisttc antecedents of Samaria (the five husbands) says, that even the Samaritan's present God is not a true God. The words 'he whom thou now hast is not thy husband' refer to the conception of God specific to the Baruch-gnosis, *i.e.* the Good One (Hippol. *Refut.*, *V* 24, 27 [ὁ ἐπάνω πάντων ἀγαθός, ὁ ἀγαθός, cf. esp. V 26]). Also this conception of God is refuted by the Christian religious consciousness. (8) Jn 4^{19}: The heretical Jew recognizes that the representative of Christian truth is a prophet, *i.e.* that »das Übergewicht religiöser Wahrheit auf seiner Seite liegt». The expression, προφήτης εἶ σύ, is chosen with allusion to the title '*λαλιὰ προφητικὴ* διὰ βαρούχ' of the Baruch-book and to the peculiarity of the Justinian Gnosticism of 'handing down other prophetic sayings in many books'.[2] (9) Jn 4$^{20, 21}$: Jerusalem symbolises orthodox Judaism, Garizim not the real Samaritanism in its historical sense, but the ophitic apostates. Jn 4^{21} puts forth the 'worship of the Father' as new form of religion, by and in which both orthodox and heretic Judaism are surmounted. (10) Jn 4$^{22-24}$: the Jewish gnostic knows not what he worships because in the Jewish gnosticism the Divine is removed beyond all form of human knowledge and represented as a pure mystery[3], in contrast to the Christian gnosis, to which God as the Father is near to men's life and possesses the form of human spiritual life. (11) Jn 4 25, 26: these vss. reflect the historical recognition of J from the side of the Jewish gnosticism, as it is attested even in the Baruch-book; against the mere recognition of the historical J of Nazareth the author puts up the demand for the recognition of the author's spiritual conception of J. The words 'I that speak unto thee' have as their real subject the author himself, not J.

---

[1] Kreyenbühl, *a. a. O.*, ii p. 407: »'Rufe deinen Mann' heisst ohne Bild: Sprechen wir jetzt von Gott, der in der Sprache Israels der Ehemann Israels heisst ... So wird auch im Baruchbuche das Verhältnis von Elohim und Edem (Israel) weitläufig als Eheverhältnis dargestellt (Hippol., *Refut. V* 26: Vgl. bes.... Ἐδὲμ γὰρ λέγεται καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἡ σύζυγος τοῦ Ἐλωείμ).

[2] Hippol., *Refut. V* 27: κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τρόπον καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ῥήσεις τὰς (*var.* λαλιὰς) προφητικὰς ὁμοίως παράδουσι διὰ πλειόνων βιβλίων.

[3] Kreyenbühl, *a. a. O.*, p. 413: »Beim jüdischen Gnostiker geht das Göttliche über die Gestalt der persönlichen Erfahrung des Menschen und ihre Formen hinaus, es hat nicht die Form des Menschlichen Geistes und seiner Wahrheit und Wirklichkeit. Erst das wahre religiöse Bewusstsein erkennt und besitzt Gott als Vater, in der Innerlichkeit und Wirklichkeit des eigenen Geistes.» p. 416: »das Hauptgewicht ist in unserer Stelle darauf gelegt, das die Vertreter des jüdischen Gottesbegriffes auch in der Form der Gnosis nicht wissen, was sie anbeten, mit anderen Worten dass das Göttliche nicht die wahre Form immanenter persönlicher Erfahrung hat, sondern sich in einem unerkennbaren Dunkel verliert, zu welchem gewisse geheimnisvolle Weihen hinführen, welche der Eingeweihte eidlich geheimzuhalten sich verpflichten muss, dass dagegen der christliche Mystiker und Gnostiker weiss, was er anbetet, weil sowohl wahre menschliche Religion (der ἀληθινὸς προσκυνητής) als das wahre göttliche Wesen selbst (ὁ πατήρ) die volle Lebensgemeinschaft von Gott und Mensch in der Form des

The symbolical character of the controversial dialogue with the Samaritan woman can scarcely be doubted. It may be argued, however, that Kreyenbühl's ingenious deductions can only partly be accepted as convincing. Nevertheless on account of the thorough method he adopts, Kreyenbühl's argument may be made the basis of a critical investigation into the allusive import of the controversial aspect of Jn 4.

1. The account is introduced by a comprehensive statement of local and historical connexions: Samaria, the town of Sychar, the lot which *Jacob* gave to his son *Joseph,* the well of *Jacob.* The same local and historical connexions are emphatically referred to twice again in the sequel of the story: vs. 12 and vs. 20. Jn pictures the essential importance attached by the religious circle in question to their 'fathers', to the mount Garizim as the true place of worship. The representation exactly corresponds to the features characteristic of the Samaritan traditions as known to us. It appears, indeed, as if the author wanted to convey that the circle intended consisted actually and literally of Samaritans, with their characteristic idiosyncrasies, not forgetting the permanent conscious opposition against the Jewish falsification of religious tradition and the Divine gift of the Tora.

2. The woman does not know the real gift of God, does not understand the full import of the Divine gift. On the other hand J acknowledges in her an attitude of spirit, which would cause her to ask for and receive that gift if only she knew it. (Jn 4 10.)

Geistseins zur Voraussetzung hat. Es ist also ... zu sagen, dass unsere Stelle allen Versuchen, die Gottheit ihrem Wesen nach über die Erfahrung des menschlichen Wesens hinaus zu verlegen, das Christentum als die Religion der immanenten Gotteserfahrung und Gottesverehrung, als Religion des Geistes und der Wahrheit, gegenüberstellt. V. 24 ist also der richtige Text eines mystischen, innerlichen, autonom persönlichen, in wurzelhafter Solidarität von Gott und Mensch sich vollziehenden, heroischen Christentums, in dem der in solche Weise religiöse Mensch als Person und Gemeinschaft selbst der wahre Tempel Gottes ist.»

This is most probably to be interpreted thus: the religious life of the circle or community in question is one of potential receptivity for the spiritual truth. The community adheres faithfully to traditions in their conception of which (the 'water of Jacob's well') they do not yet possess the spiritual, eternal life. »Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again.» But their adherence to their faith does not make them inimical to the truth. Their 'water' is in a certain sense, if not the real water of life, yet, a prefiguration of the living water. That J asks the Samaritan woman to give him to drink of her water accords with this. With his request, as is also implied by vs. 9, J demonstrates that he does not reject the faith of the community, and conveys that their faith may lead them to the obtainment of the living water, when they recognize in him the giver of the Divine Gift, the Teacher of Righteousness, the Messiah whom they believed would come in the fulfilment of time.

3. This interpretation is corroborated by comparison with J's attitude to the Jewish conceptions and the Jewish presumption of adherence to the tradition of the 'fathers' and to the Divine truth given by them. When the Jews say: 'Abraham is our father' J denies this and answers: 'If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham ... Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do ... And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not ... He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God' (Jn 8^{39-47}). The legitimacy of the Samaritan's appeal to their continuity with the 'fathers' is not contested by one word. J only offers the community a fulfilment of their hope, the reality of what they as yet possess only potentially or imperfectly. Suggestive is a comparison of the parallel controversial utterances of $4^{12\text{ ff.}}$ and $8^{53\text{ ff.}}$ The Samaritan woman says: μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ ... and finishes by asking for the living water offered by J; the Jews ask scornfully: μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ... and finish by trying to stone J. The literally identical question in the Samaritan woman's mouth means: »Are you possibly greater than our father Jacob?», in the mouth of the Jews, again: »Certainly thou art not greater than our father Abraham!» By the same contexts it is implied, that the Samaritan woman, who is ready, seemingly, to desert her traditional religion (vs. 15^{b}), is in reality faithful towards the element of truth received from the fathers, whereas the Jews, who, were ap-

parently unswervingly loyal to the inheritance from their father Abraham and to the Tora of Moses, in opposition to the demands of J, had already severed themselves spiritually and intrinsically from the way of Abraham and the Tora of Moses, for »Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad (8^{56})». And »had ye (really, as you pretend) believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me».

4. With regard to the references to the marital connexions of the Samaritan woman there should scarcely be any doubt that there is an inherent allusion to the religious past and present of the community in question; to quote Estlin Carpenter[1]: »when the Samaritan woman is told that she has no husband but has had five (John iv. 18), the figure may outwardly imply the supernatural knowledge of the Incarnate Son; but inwardly it points (as has long been recognized, — cp., for instance, Wordsworth, *New Test.* 1886, *in loc.*[2]) to the gods brought by the five groups of settlers transported from Mesopotamia by the Assyrian concquerors after the fall of the Northern Kingdom (2 Kings. xvii. 24, 31). Who, then, was the contemporary who was no true husband? It is sometimes supposed that it was the God of Israel ignorantly worshipped on Mount Gerizim, to whom the unchaste woman was no true wife. But if the previous identification be correct, it seems more consonant with analogy to look for some representative of false teaching. The Christian father Jerome . . . found him in Dositheus, who was reputed to have been a disciple of John the Baptist and to have claimed to be the prophet predicted by Moses (*Dict. Eccl. Biography.*, art. by Salmon). A sect possessing books attributed to him maintained a local existence till the sixth century. Mixed up with his story is the figure of Simon the Mage (Acts viii 9) whom the early Church regarded as the father of all heresy. The statement of Justin (1 Apol. xxvi), himself born in the country, that he was worshipped by almost all the Samaritans, has led some modern students to fix on him. Neither interpretation may be correct, but Jerome's reference implies his conviction that the conversation beside the well carried within it a historic meaning.» It may be surmised that the criterion for a right interpretation of the woman's husband who is not really her husband must be, that it must fit in, on one hand with the mystical reference to the depth of the well, requiring an ἄντλημα wherewith to draw the

---

[1] *JWr*, p. 245.

[2] so also Kreyenbühl, *op. cit.* ii, p. 407.

water, on the other hand to the obvious connexion with the Divine command received from the fathers concerning the Mount of Garizim (Argarizim) as the right τόπος ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ. That is, the context implies that the 'husband' cannot be identified with a religious leader or a cult or a type of Gnostic belief that has already severed its adherents from the rigid observance of the traditional form of worship linked with Argarizim, but, on the other hand, that the reference must be to some contempary aspiration towards the knowledge of the 'depths' or 'secrets', probably the 'depths' or 'secrets' of the Tora (= the well).

Gaster[1] has shown that within the confines of the adherents to what may be termed the Samaritan religion, there existed from about 200 B.C. onwards numerous circles devoted to mystical speculations starting from the received text of the Pentateuch (the Samaritan Tora) parallel to the similar development of mystical notions within Judaism. In the text of the Tora, mystically propounded, »every mystery of heaven and earth had to find its solution». »It is a Divine work, and every word in it (is) of Divine origin; it is infallible, and its potency and efficacy immeasurable. It is only a question of knowing how to make use of the secret powers hidden in the text . . .» This mysticism was clearly at home with members of the Samaritan community which on every point held on to the traditions respecting *H*^{a}*lākā* and worship, purported to be received from the fathers and the 'elders'.[2] On the other hand, there was an almost insensible transition from the circles within the traditional bounds to the synchretistic sects that may be called Gnostics proper. »This very manipulation of words and letters, this endowment of every word and sign with a deeper meaning, opened the door to all kinds of fantastic speculations, and paved the way for those sectarian tendencies and Gnostic influences — although, no doubt, at a later period [*scil.*, than the 2nd century B.C.] — which were able to work upon the speculative mind of the Samaritans. Men arose who read a different and deeper meaning into the simple words of the text, and thus claimed for themselves the right of proclaiming a different truth. This very freedom of interpretation, this mystical exegesis and hermeneutics, lies at the basis of all mystical speculations: hence the rise of so many sects on the soil of Palestine. None of them started from abstract systems wholly unconnected with ancient traditions, independent theories by which the problems of the world were solved and the deeper mysteries revealed.» The problems in the forefront for the deeper religious minds within the Samaritan community under the influence of the religious conditions of the times were here as elsewhere those of 'the Beginnings and the End, of the spiritual life of man, of death and immortality, of reward and punishment, and concomitant with it the idea of a divinely appointed Redeemer or guide and resurrection'.[1]

---

[1] *The Samaritans, their History, Doctrines and Literature* 1925, pp. 79 ff.

[2] *i.e.* »the seventy elders chosen by Moses in the wilderness to whom he had entrusted a copy of the Law». Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 119.

These mystical ideas of the depths or secrets of the Tora as the basis for the knowledge and attainment of higher truths are traceable in the classical Samaritan writings. Especially important is Markah's commentary to the Pentateuch, from which relevant passages are cited in Appendix I. The conception in general is parallel to the Jewish mystical terms מעין חכמה (well of wisdom מעין תורה (well of Tora), סודי תורה and סתרי תורה (secrets of mysteries of Tora) (cf. above p. 160).

For the Samaritan treatment of the conception of immortality and of the Messiah, Gaster may again be referred to.[2]

The resurrection is proved from *Gen* 3^{19} where the Samaritan Hebrew text runs[3]:

---

[1] Gaster, *op. cit.* pp. 84 ff. pictures the development of the mystical ideas within and outside the community as follows: »Jews and Samaritans alike also had to face [the problems arising out of the religious condition of the times] and take up a definite position, if they were not to be sucked down in the general whirlpool, and to succumb to the new flood of ideas and superstitions which at that time swept the world . . . They were, no doubt, satisfied with the razing of the ancient idols, but they could not view with equanimity the erection of new ones; . . . the danger was twofold: the first was to admit all the new ideas without questioning, and to incorporate them into their own code of laws and doctrines by assimilating them to their own standards and principles; in that way they gradually became assimilated to the strange world of ideas without, with the consequent loosening of the hold which the Law had upon them. The other danger was to try and find a justification for this very process of undiluted assimilation in the words of the sacred text. The former led to apostasy and to the erection of idols in the Temples of Jerusalem and Sichem: the other to the creation of sects, some of whom still clung closely to the old faith, but who subjected the text to a dissolving exegesis until it assumed that mystical interpretation which we find in the writings of Philo, . . . This activity in its turn led either to other peculiar interpretations of an ascetic character or to the mystic speculations of the Gnostic schools.»

[2] Gaster, *op. cit.* pp. 88 ff.

[3] as transcribed in Hebrew square characters.

כי עפר אתה ואל עפרך תשוב
'ki afar atta u̯æl afarak tešob': for thou art dust and to *thy* dust thou shalt return.[1]

The existence of future punishment and reward is proved from *Gen* 9^{5}[2] and especially from *Deut* 32^{35}, where the Samaritan version has: ליום נקם ושלם *eli̯om neqam ušelam,* on the day of vengeance and recompense. From the same chapter »a whole theory of life after death, of punishment and reward and of the final events» was evolved.

An important early conception is also that of the contrast between the present age of *Fanuta,* »the dark, abysmal period, the terrible period of Fanuta» and the future *Rahuta*, implying a life in the constant shadow of God's favour and love.[3]

With the advent of the *Rahuta* the appearance of the Restorer, the *Taëb* (תהב) or Šaëb (שהב') is closely connected. The Samaritans rest their expectation of the advent of the *Taëb* on the promise given in their tenth commandment[4] and on *Deut.* 18$^{15, 18}$. 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a *prophet* from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken . . .

---

[1] »They interpret this to mean that Adam and of course every human being . . . will return again to live in the same material form in which he was when he died.»

[2] Sam. version:

ואך את דמכם לנפשתיכם אדרש מיד כל חי אדרשנו

reading: 'living being' instead of 'wild beast' and referring it to the punishment to be meted out after death to the man who has commited suicide.

[3] »There is nothing really eschatological connected with that period, it is, in fact, to precede the time when the end of the world will be expected and the fate of mankind finally decided . . . No definite period, however, is assigned to the period of Divine favour; this may come at any time and will take place as soon as the necessary conditions for such an era of happiness have been fulfilled. It must be made perfectly clear that the Samaritans *do not expect this period to be one of conquest or great power:* it is nothing but *absolute freedom and peace, together with the conversion of the Jews* to the recognition of the fact that they had been led astray in a strange error by their false prophets . . .: Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 90.

[4] repeating *Deut* 18^{18}, 5^{30} *Exod* 20^{22}, vide Gaster *op. cit.* p. 187: »By inserting here this promise that a prophet like Moses will arise in the future, who will be sent by God, and to whose voice they are bidden to hearken, a unique importance has been given to it. It has been placed next to the commandments as being uttered by God on the very same solemn occasion. One cannot overestimate the value just assigned to it, for it assumes a character of its own and becomes the basis of all the eschatological speculations which are later on crystallized in the belief of a Taëb.»

I will raise them up a *prophet* from among their brethren like unto thee; and I will put my words in his mouth, and *he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him*'. There is evidence even in outside sources that the expectation of the *Taëb* was widespread at the time of J.[1] A prominent feature in the *Taëb*-traditions was that the Redeemer, in accordance with Deut 18^{18}, would teach the faithful concerning all things, he is the 'Teacher', *muri* or *mudi*. On this point the Samaritan teaching »agrees with the views entertained by the Sadoqites». Cf. how in the Sadoqite Fragments the Messiah is termed the 'Teacher of Righteousness' (above p. 155).

But even during the *Fanuta* before the advent of *the* prophet, the *Taëb*, true 'prophets' can arise. The Samaritans' rejection of the prophetic literature of the Jewish canon does not imply any lessening of the importance attached to the functions of a true prophet, *nebi*. On the contrary, this conception seems to have played a distinctive rôle from the earliest down to the latest times.[2]

The controversies between Samaritans and Jews on the point of the right place of worship, as they appear, from the Jewish point of view, in Rabbinical writings (and also in Josephus), are set forth exhaustively by Billerbeck.[3] Not a single detail of the Jewish representation of the controversy seems to have escaped Billerbeck's notice. It may be allowed, therefore, simply to refer here to his exposition.[4] It need scarcely be pointed out, however, that the Jewish representation gives no adequate picture of the

---

[1] Wellknown is the relation in Josephus' *Antiq.* 18. 4. 1, 2 of a man »who went up to Mount Garizim at the time of Pilate and gathered the people round him, promising to discover the hidden vessels of the Temple» a feature in the traditions of the expected Taëb. (Cf. Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 21).

[2] Thus in the '*Dream of Abiša*' (given e. g. in J. H. Petermann's *Chrest. Sam.* pp. 24—28) the angels before the Divine Throne of Light, speaking to Moses of Abiša the priest ascending in the dream to heaven in the company of Moses:

אה נבי אלהים ומושיע ישראל כן זה נבי בעתו כמודיע ישראל

'... O, thou prophet of God, and saviour of Israel, thus this one is a prophet in his time and a teacher of Israel'.

[3] i pp. 549—551.

[4] Reference may also be made to L. Gulkowitsch's comment upon and translation of the tractate כותים, belonging to the so-called smaller tractates of the Talmud, and setting forth mainly the ritual differences between the Samaritans and the Jews from the Jewish point of view: *Der kleine Tatmudtraktat über die Samariter* in ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ i (1925) pp. 48—56.

Samaritan view on the subject.[1] The basis of the Samaritan contentions is pregnantly and adequately expressed by Jn 4^{20} *οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσεκύνησαν.* The Samaritans were conscious of preserving the form and place of worship of their 'fathers'. The Samaritan reading of *Deut* 27$^{4\text{f.}}$ is wellknown.[2] From the time of Israel's entrance into the promised land onwards, according to the Samaritans, the worship was carried on at that place. Of importance in connexion with Jn 4 is what Gaster[3] tells us concerning the incorporation in the Samaritan community of the heathen garrisons, (the 'five nations'). Whereas the Jewish traditions in accordance with 2 Ki 17^{25} ff. term the Samaritans 'proselytes out of fear for the lions'[4], at the same time trying to convey that the whole Samaritan community arose from the converted heathen settlers[5], »in the Samaritan tradition the matter assumes a totally different aspect. . . . They state that by the carrying into exile of the High Priest and the priests who ministered in the Sanctuary at Beth-El, *i.e.* Garizim, the service of God had come to a standstill . . . with the result that the curse which had been threatened in Leviticus[6] and Deuteronomy[7] came to pass. With the cessation of worship, drought set in, famine followed, and wild beasts overran the land . . .» The real cause of the carrying away of the High Priest and the priests into exile was their own sins. In the calamity following upon the cessation of right worship »were involved not only the inhabitants of the land who had strayed from the true worship of God, but the new-comers as well. It is, therefore, in the name of the whole community that the governor and garrison for the time being sent the request to the king to have the High Priest returned and the worship re-established.» This request having been granted, the High Priest Seraya returned, accompanied by a number of Samaritans from the exile. With the ensuing re-establishment of worship the Samaritans definitely broke with the idolatrous practices, or, as it may be expressed by the Jn-ine simile: with the five former husbands. Historical is, that the Samaritans from this time onwards strongly emphasized the monotheistic character of their faith.[1]

---

[1] just as the Rabbinical references to Samaritan denial of resurrection and after-life are misleading.

[2] והיה בעברכם את הירדן תקימו את האבנים האלה אשר אנכי מצוה
אתכם היום בהרגריזים ושדת אתם בשיד ובנית שם מזבח ליהוה אלהיך
The Israelites entering Kanaan built the first altar on Argarizim acc. to Moses's command.

[3] *op. cit.* pp. 18 f.

[4] *TB Niddā* 56 b, *Ḥullin* 3 b: גירי אריות

[5] The very term frequently used for Samaritans, 'Kuþim', is an opprobrium implying their pagan origin.

[6] *Lev* 26$^{21\text{f}}$

[7] *Deut* 6$^{12\text{ff.}}$

On the basis of Gaster's work on the Samaritans, founded as it is on first-hand research on original and authentic sources it may be admissible to urge that *the controversial issue of Jn 4 is with a circle of Samaritans that are wholly within the bounds of what we have termed the Samaritan community.* Further the Samaritans in question are representative of the tendency towards the mystical speculations and interpretations of the Tora, and towards the seeking in the Tora of the deepest secrets of salvation and of communion with the spiritual world. For the symbolism of the ἄντλημα and the deep well, the dictum preserved in *Cant R* 1$_7$ and quoted above p. 160 may be considered illustrative. When, therefore, the Samaritan woman is represented as saying to J: 'you have nothing wherewith to draw, no ἄντλημα' this may approximately be rendered: 'You do not — at least so it seems to me — possess the mystical training nor are you familiar with the mystical traditions by which the life-giving secrets of the Tora are brought to light, and the acquisition of these requires much study and meditation (miđraš). Further it may be possible to offer a conjecture as to the allusion to the 'present husband' of the Samaritan woman. The words 'I have no husband', in the mouth of the Samaritan woman, in view of the strong emphasis on monotheism and the strict adherence to the Divine Tora received through the fathers, most probably mean: 'We are not allied with any foreign cult'. The answer is: »I acknowledge the truth of what you say. Formerly you were allied with the worship of the gods of the five 'nations', but now you worship and seek to find the only, true God, the Father, I̭HU̯H *(šima)*. He is your only God, or husband. But, I tell you, that he is not *yet* really your God ('he is not thine husband'), for you do not know him.» The import of the words 'he whom thou now hast is not thy husband', is the same as that of the utterance 'ye worship what ye know not' and this, again, as was maintained above, refers to the same necessity of entering the spiritual world in order to know the spiritual realities as treated of in Jn 3^{3-21}.

---

[1] Cf. L. Gulkowitsch, *a. a. O.* p. 49: »Auch sie (the Samaritans) verehren Gott als rein geistiges Wesen, auf welches sinnliche Bezeichnungen und Vergleiche nicht angewendet werden dürfen. Der Monotheismus begegnet uns bei ihnen sogar in reinerer Form als gleichzeitig bei den Juden, da sie alle menschlichen Anklänge im Gottesnamen und seinen Attributen beseitigen.»

Whether it can be said with Hamburger (*Real-Encykl. etc.* p. 1068) and Gulkowitsch (*a. a. O.* p. 50) that 'Kuthæans' and 'Dosithæans' are to be regarded as different sects divided on the matter of greater or lesser assimilation with Jewish religion and statutes is highly doubtful.

Hence the point of the controversy is the same as in Jn 3^{3-21}, viz. the contrast between the reality of the spirit and of spiritual life in man on one hand and on the other a mere external, one might say objective, relation to the spirit, and along with this the truth, that J alone, can mediate this reality to man.

As has already been pointed out, the character of the controversial attitude of Jn 4 is quite different from that of Jn 3. In Jn 4 J acknowledges the sincerity of the religious aspiration of the Samaritans addressed. Hence it must be maintained, that the reference to the husband which is no husband of vs. 18 cannot be meant to convey any moral defect of the Samaritans. The idea of concubinage or adultery is evidently absent even from the outward form of the story. The woman, although convinced of the truth, shows no trace of understanding J's words as implying a reprimand of her private life.[1] Neither is there in J's words a single hint of an injunction to the woman to make amends; nor is she in the rest of the chapter represented as disobedient or as one who »doeth the evil and therefore hates the light». On the contrary, there is in vss. 32 ff. a covert allusion to »the missionary joy of J»[2] as caused by the result of the dialogue with the woman which is entirely inexplicable on the supposition that J in vs. 18 has touched the »unpleasant subject» of the womans private life without being able to touch her conscience.[3] In effect, vs. 18 must be considered as finishing rather with a laudatory utterance than with one of blame. It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that the symbolical interpretation of vss. 16—18 gives a perfectly natural connexion of thought both with the preceding and the following portions.

---

[1] This is expressed, although in a different vein, by Loisy, *Le Quatrième Év.*, p. 182: »L'idée du concubinage empêche certains d'admettre, que le mari soit Iahvé; mais cette idée n'est pas exprimée dans le texte et c'est avec intention qu'on ne l'a pas formulée. Le dieu d'Israël est pour les Samaritains un dieu étranger, dont ils ont d'autant moins le droit de se réclamer qu'ils n'observent pas vraiment sa Loi.»

[2] The expression is Dr Strachan's in his *Fourth Gospel* p. 108.

[3] The only secondary meaning of vs. 18 is to convey J's immediate knowledge of the woman's past, which to her was a sign that he was a prophet: εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα ($4^{29, 39}$) cf. above p. 43 f.

Lastly it may be of some moment to consider in the light of the preceding, the words: Μεσσίας . . . ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. It is difficult to interpret this as being merely an elucidation included for the readers of the gospel, as may possibly by the case with 1^{41}. The real intention is perhaps the identification even of the Samaritan Messiah with the historical Χριστός of the Christians. That it might go back on an original '*Taëb,* who is called Messiah' may be proffered as a conjecture which, however, may be regarded as uncertain.[1]

ἐγὼ βρῶσιν ἔχω φαγεῖν ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε (4^{32}) . . . **ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν, ἵνα ποι(ήσ)ῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον** (4^{34}). For the ideas centering round the conception of the spiritual βρῶμα *vide* below on 6^{27}. Here is to be noticed especially the expression ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε, which may be recognized as the technical expression for a reality belonging to the spiritual world as put in contrast to the terrestrial, 'this-world' experience of the hearer or hearers addressed. The utterance is parallel with 3^{11} 4^{10} and 4^{22}, also with 7^{29} (ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ᾽ ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε), $8^{14,15}$ (ὅτι οἶδα, πόθεν ἦλθον καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω. ὑμεῖς δε᾽ οὐκ οἴδατε, πόθεν ἔρχομαι ἢ ποῦ ὑπάγω· ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε), 8^{19} (οὔτε ἐμὲ οἴδατε οὔτε τὸν πατέρα μου), $8^{54,55}$ (ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δοξάζων με, ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν, καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν, ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν.) Just as J, acc. to $4^{14\text{ff.}}$, tells the Samaritan woman of the gift which she does not yet know or understand, he tells his disciples of the spiritual food which they do not yet know. It consists in doing the will of his Father who sent him, and in finishing his work. Similarly in 6^{27-29} the ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ is connected with the spiritual food, ἡ βρῶσις ἡ μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, *quo vide.* The significance of $4^{32,34}$ immediately becomes clear, when read in the light of $6^{27—29}$ and 14^{12} (ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ τὰ ἔργα, ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, κἀκεῖνος ποιήσει, καὶ μείζονα τούτων ποιήσει, ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι). The spiritual food, which in J is a communion with the Father in unity of activity (14^{10}: ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ), will be given by the Son of man to those who 'believe', and they will henceforth partake of the Divine activity. It is evident that $4^{32,34}$ represent the same central ideas as those met with in 1^{51}, $3^{3—21}$ and $4^{7—26}$ (cf. above pp. 39, 40, 95—100, 130). — The object of the introduction in this context of the J-dictum in question is evidently to express that J had really done His Father's work through opening the eyes of the Samaritan woman to the reality of the living water. But this implies also that he had been received as the living Water and the spiritual food by believing Samaritans. In order further to stress the point that the Samaritans actually attained to real belief in him, the narrative of vss. 39—42 is superadded. The question of the historical background for the Samaritan receptivity for J's teaching and the salvation offered by him, will be dwelt on in the second part of the present work, treating of the narrative portions of Jn. Here it will be sufficient to point out, that Jn, by the use of terms and words μαρτυρεῖν, μένειν, πιστεῦσαι-πιστεύειν, ἀκηκόαμεν καὶ οἴδαμεν, ἀληθῶς, σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, connects the historical relation with the ideas of the preceding discourses. With this Jn conveys that the Samaritans attained to a *real* experience of the spiritual world in J. Hence, it may also be surmised, the use of the term ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου in the Samaritans' mouth primarily links up with $3^{16,17}$. It is intended as a final emphasis on the fact that the Samaritan accepted the Divine gift in its whole bearing, as it is expressed by the words: οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν *κόσμον*, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν [αὐτοῦ] τὸν μονογενῆ *ἔδωκεν*, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ *πιστεύων* εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν *κόσμον*, ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα *σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος* δι' αὐτοῦ (Jn $3^{16,17}$). For references to the vast literature on the formula σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου *vide* Bauer, J *Ev*² p. 71 and cf. further especially G. P. Wetter, *SG* pp. 51, 52.

---

[1] Cf. Zahn, *Ev J,* 5, 6 p. 251: »Wie einen Eigennamen ohne Artikel gebraucht Jo hier (nicht so 141) die griech. Transskription des aram. מְשִׁיחָא, schwerlich mit Rücksicht auf die determinirte Apposition ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. Denn dies kann ja nicht der Rede der S. angehören . . . Es kann dies also nur ebenso wie die gleichbedeutenden Worte 1, 31, 41 und manche ähnlich, eine Zwischenbemerkung des Ev. sein, die für seine Leser ein Bedürfnis war. Auch hier, an der entscheidenden Stelle des Gesprächs, will Jo dem originalen Laut der Rede festhalten . . . Dies scheint aber vorauszusetzen, dass das Weib wirklich dieses jüdisch-aramäische Wort und nicht irgend ein bei der Samaritern übliches Synonymon gebraucht habe.»

It remains to touch upon the question of the Samaritan acceptance of J in relation to the doctrine of the spiritual universalism expressed in ch. 4 (e. g. vss. 20 and 42), as elsewhere in the Gospel. There will be no reason to dispute the thesis that the narrative illustrates the extension of the 'religion of J' beyond the boundaries of the Jewish community.[1] But on the other hand this does not cover the whole purpose of the record. What has again to be kept in view, is the strong emphasis of the Samaritan adherence to the teaching of the 'fathers', by the side of the ease with which so faithful adherents to the received traditions as Samaritans are represented as being, seemingly desert their traditional faith and accept J as the saviour of the world. Further the supercession of the traditional worship by the worship in spirit and truth and of the traditional water by the living water must be considered in the light of J's willingness to drink of this traditional water and of the fact that J is recognized by the Samaritan woman as the Messiah, prophet and teacher whose future advent she had been taught to expect. In view of these facts the purpose, it seems, is rather to teach: *those who are inwardly directed towards the spiritual, the light, recognize in the light, when it comes to them, the true meaning and the fulfilment of their traditional faith.* They do not even, in reality, desert the traditional faith, for Moses wrote of J (5^{46}) and Abraham, the father, saw his day and was glad (8^{56}). On this interpretation the side-reference to the Jewish faith receives a clear justification. The arguments of the Jews who according to $5^{39, 45}$, 6^{31}, $8^{39, 53}$ tried to justify their rejection of J by their loyalty to Moses and Abraham and their adherence to the Scripture are here refuted by the simple fact that the Samaritans, who were even more strict than the Jews in their literal observance of the Tora found in J the fulfilment of the promises contained in the Tora. (It may be surmised, in passing, that vs. 9 implies an allusion to this false loyalty or exclusivity of the inimical Jews: 'How is it that thou, *being a Jew,* askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria'.) Thus the narrative demonstrates the truth of the reprimand to the Jews: the reason why you reject J is not at all to be sought in your belief in Moses or your sonship of Abraham; the reason is that you hate the light, because you do not do the truth ($3^{20, 21}$), and this again shows, that you do *not* believe in Moses (5^{47}) nor are the children of your father Abraham (8^{39}), but, instead the children of the διάβολος, the father of falsehood (8^{44}); it is significant that the Jews' retort to this reprimand is: 'say we not well that thou art a *Samaritan* . . .?' (8^{48}).

---

[1] Samaria as »the nearest representative of the world outside the Jew» E. Carpenter, *JW*, p. 385, P. Gardner, *Eph. Gosp.* pp. 221, 222 E. F. Scott, 4 *Gosp.* p. 110 R. H. Strachan, 4 *Gosp.* p. 100.

It may be put forth as a hypothesis, that the words of vss. 35—38, in the connexion in which they now stand[1], are to be interpreted as an allusion to the salvation through J as being a true fulfilment of the longings, and expectations of the fathers. *ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἵνα ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων . . . ἄλλος ἐστιν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων . . . ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασιν, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε.* Whatever may be the original significance of the passage, it is probably to be understood here somewhat as follows: J recognizes in the traditional faith of the Samaritans the work of a Divine sowing; with the gift of the Tora God has sown in the Samaritans a seed, which with the coming of J as the Messiah has become a harvest which he can reap. With Zahn[2] the singular σπείρων and θερίζων are to be taken as referring to God and J respectively. In the 'fathers', Moses and the 'prophets', acknowledged by the Samaritans, J recognizes workers, sent by God to labour with the sowing[3], the harvest of which J sends his disciples to reap in accordance with Lk 10^{1-17}. In its deepest sense the 'labour' perhaps means the longing for the 'living water', for Messiah, the teacher of righteousness and restorer of the happy age of communion with God, which J knows to have been present in the worshippers of the past and by them communicated to the present generation.

The discursive part of Jn 5 may for the purpose of the present investigation conveniently be divided into two sections, comprising (1) vss. 19—29 and (2) vss. 30—47.

The first section turns immediately to the subject of the relation between the Father and the Son: . . . *ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν, ἂν μή τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα· ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ.* (5^{10}) Thus this relation is first viewed under the aspect of the performance of the Father's work. This, in accordance with the characteristic form of the Jn-ine discourses, forms a clear connexion with the last discursive utterance, that of $4^{32,34}$. A further connexion with the preceding sections is established by vs. 20: *ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ, καὶ μείζονα τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαυμάζητε.*

---

[1] It will be urged in part ii that the passage has rightly been taken as not emanating from Jn. A superficial analysis shows in any case that it does not belong to the Jn-ine discourses.

[2] *Ev. J.* ^{5,6} p. 263.

[3] cf. Zahn, *op. cit.* ib. E. Carpenter, *JWr.*

The former part of this verse is an allusion to the subject of the Divine Love in 3 16 and the latter part recalls the wording of 1 50, 51 (μείζω τούτων . . . ὄψεσθε). The specific aspect of the present discourse is introduced with vs. 21, though even here in connexion with earlier conceptions and expressions: ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοποιεῖ, οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὓς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ.

The relation between the Father and the Son is one of complete dependence upon and obedience to the Father on the part of the Son, but, on the other hand, this is characterized by the complete conferment on the part of the Father upon the Son of the Father's whole authority and power: (1) the Son does the Father's 'works', (2) . . . he gives life, 'makes living' the dead, (3) executes judgement, is the judge of the world. 22 οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκεν τῷ υἱῷ . . . 27 καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστιν . . . 29 καὶ ἐκπορεύσονται . . . οἱ . . . τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως . . . ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν. The relation between the Son and the world in his function of Life-giver and Judge is further pictured under the simile of the *Voice* calling from the world of the Father into the lower world. The reaction of the voice upon the lower world, or upon the 'dead', constitutes the occurrence which inaugurates the judgement or the condemnation for some, the obtainment of life for others: 25 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν, ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσωσι τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσουσιν . . . 28 ἔρχεται ὥρα, ἐν ᾗ πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις ἀκούσωσι τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ . . . But it is emphasized that the relation between the Son and the world is *eo ipso* a relation between the Father and the world; the attitude taken towards the Son implies the same attitude towards the Father: 23 ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι τὸν υἱὸν καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα. ὁ μὴ τιμῶν τὸν υἱὸν οὐ τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτόν . . . 30 ὅτι οὐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με.

Among Mandæan parallels reference may be made in the first place to the following:

GL I 1 424 29—425 2 (*Pet* 2 2—5)

האילאך קריואיא ופאקדיא וזאהריא דשאדריא הייא רביא
קאדמאייא לצאוריאיל שאריא (ולקמאמיר זיוא) דשאריא ודאבאר
רוהיא ונישמאתא מן פאגרא ומותא ניתיקריא באלמא וכושטא
ניתיקריא על דיאדיא דיאדילה . . .

»Then the *Great First Life called, appointed*, equipped and *sent* Saurʿel, the *Deliverer*, (and Qmamir Ziu̯a), who delivers and removes the souls and spirits from the body. And he is called *Death* in the world, but *Kušṭa* (Truth) he is called by those who know [the initiate], who know of him.»

In *GL I 1* the Angel of Death carries the functions of an *appointed* Messenger, and the stress is laid on the Messenger-aspect: he is falsely called Death, in reality he is *Truth* (cf. Jn 14^{6}: ἐγώ εἰμι . . . ἡ ἀλήθεια. Important parallels are the following features: (1) Saurel, the Deliverer, is sent to 'voice a *call* to Adam', the first man, (cf. Jn $5^{24, 25, 28}$ ἡ φωνῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ), (2) the object of the voice called forth to Adam is to take him out of earthly life into the true life through his earthly death (cf. Jn 5^{24}: μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν, 5^{25}); (3) the Messenger *speaks the words that the First Life commands him to speak* and 'doeth the works' of the First Life (cf. Jn $5^{17, 19\text{ f.}, 36}$ 8^{26} ἃ ἤκουσα παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ταῦτα λαλῶ); (4) Adam, to whom the voice is made heard, is called 'mute, foolish, deaf and veiled'[1]; acc. to Jn 5^{25} those who hear the voice of the Son of God are the 'dead', οἱ νεκροί. (5) What is brought about by the Deliverer's 'work' and 'voice' in taking away the spirit from the body of death, or the 'life of death' (*i.e.* in the lower world, the earthly existence) to the true life, is the union of Life with Life, that is to say, of the Great First Life with the awakened life in man, through the Messenger. Hence the section *(GL I 1)* is concluded with the frequently occurring formula:

הייא סמאך על הייא והייא אשכא דילון הייא דילון אשכא
(יאשכית) [ואשכאת] נישמאת דמסאכיא

»The Life supported the Life, and the Life found its own (= τὸ ἴδιον); the Life found its own and my spirit found what it aspired to!»

The underlying idea is that Life is a spiritual essence, in its highest and fullest degree possessed by the Great First Life (= the Deity, ὁ πατήρ of Jn 5), and by him conferred upon the Messenger, who by virtue of his possession of Life brings the spirits of the believers into Life or rather awakens the residue of Life extant in them. Cf. Jn 5^{26}: ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἔχει ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκεν ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

---

[1] *GL I 1* $425^{9\text{ f.}, 17\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* $2^{13\text{ f.}, 21\text{ f.}}$):

יא אדאם גאברא קאדמאיא האראשא סאכלא טבושא טמורא

As in Jn the conceptions of *Life* brought from *the* Life by the Messenger are constantly connected with those of *Light, Truth* and the *Way*. The terms are interchangeable, connoting that the spiritual reality behind them is always the same. Characteristic also are the repeated instances of the identical sense of 'possessing' and 'being' and 'giving'.[1] This is, perhaps, even more marked in Mandæan literature than in Jn. Thus in *GL I 1*, here referred to, Adam addresses the Messenger both as 'O, thou caller who didst call me!' and 'thou, O Voice, that didst call me' (*GL* 425 ^{28}, 426 ^{29} [2]).

The passages speaking of the Messenger as Life and bringer of Life are numerous. In connexion with Jn 5 $^{19\text{ff.}}$ the following is of special importance:

GR XII 2 271 ^{20}—272 ^{28} (*Pet* 274 ^{10}—275 ^{7})

אתא בטאב כושטא נהורא דמאסגיא לבית רחמה בהירא אנאת
זאכאיא דמקאימית בזאכו כילא שורבתאך גימרא אנאת גמירא
בהירא דמומא ליתבה דירכא אנאת דשאלמאניא שבילא דסאליק
לאתאר נהור הייא אנאת דמן לאלאם דאסגית שרית בלבאב
כשיט . . . [275 ³] קאלא אנאת קאדמאיא דהייא מן כיניאנון קרוך
רבאיהון אנאת דגאנזיבריא דהייא שאלטוך על כול צבו שימוך
מיתיא והיון ושימוך כציריא ועתאפון תאיבית על בהיריא
ושאלמאניא דשראלון בליבאיהון כישטא

»(An alphabetical hymn.) Come in goodness, O Kušṭa (Truth), O Light, that goeth to the house of its friend(s)[3]; Thou art the Elect, Victorious One, who establishest thy whole tribe in victory.[4] Thou art a perfect Gimra[5] *(Gimra gmura)*. An Elect One, in whom there is no defect. *Thou art the way*[6] of the Perfect Ones, the path leading up to the place of light. *Thou art life from*

---

[1] Cf. above pp. 113 f., 168, 186.

[2] *Pet* 3⁷: יא קאלא דלדיליא קאריא
Pet 4²³ᶠ·: יא קארויא דלדיליא קראליא

[3] *i.e.* to the lower world, where the believers are dwelling. Cf. above p. 128.

[4] Cf. Jn 16³³ ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον.

[5] The sense of the word '*gimra*' is not clear. Cf. Lidzbarski, *GR* p. 158 n. 3. Here it might perhaps, in view of the world-play, be translated '*perfection*' or similarly.

[6] Cf. Jn 14⁶: ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή.

Eternity, who comest forth and dwellest in a truthful heart ... [*GB* 272 21]. Thou art the *first Voice,* which the Life called forth (created) out of its own nature. Thou art the greatest of the Ganzibras, to whom the Life gave command over every thing.[1] *The dead heard thy voice and lived,* and the sick heard thee and were healed. Thou forgivest the perfect and elect ones, in whose heart Kušṭa (the Truth) dwells.[2]

It is well-known that the figure of the *'Voice'* is frequent in Mand. For the connexion of the *Voice* with conferment of Life reference may further be made to

GL III 62 596 9—12 (*Pet* 137 9 f.)

באלילא דהייא קארייא עידנא דעירא ושומיא עית דשומא והייא ויעית
דעתכאלאל ישביב

»A *voice of Life* called: the ear which is wakeful hears; *some heard and lived,* but others wrapped themselves up [and continued sleeping].»

Cf. further the passages quoted above pp. 130 seqq., esp. p. 134 *(GR XI):* »... who *listened to the voice of the Life* and believed in it and were taught by it ... who hated the *death* and loved the *life* ... and *found the Life*», and p. 135 (*GR XII:* »Also all the spirits of those formed out of flesh and blood who *listen to the voice of the Life* and believe, shall dwell before the Presence, in the House of Life».

The Voice of Life is the Voice of the Messenger; as long as the Messenger is present in the world, the Voice of Life is heard there:

GR VIII 222 5—10 (*Pet* 221 8—12)

מאן דמציא למיזכיא לקאלא דהייא דהיא מן לאקאדמיא . . .
אכאנדית קאלא דהייא בתיביל איתה אכאנדית קאלא דהייא
בעודנאי נאפיל אכמא קאלא דהייא בתיביל איתה ריטנא דהיביל
זיוא שאמאנא אנא אמארנא אכאנדית היביל זיוא מן דאוה לאסליק

»Who is able to overcome the Voice of Life which was from the beginning? — Even until now the Voice of Life is in Tibil. Even until now the Voice of Life falls on my ear. As long as the Voice of Life is in the Tibil do I hear the murmuring (the Mantra) of Hibil Ziu̯a [the Messenger]. I say: 'Even until now Hibil Ziua has not ascended from his generation'.»

---

[1] Cf. Jn 5 27: ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν ...

[2] Cf. Jn 8 44, *1 Jn* 1 8, 2 4.

GR XI 266^{29-31} (*Pet* 269^{4-6})

אמרית קודאם הייא רביא דאלמא האזין דמשאדריתוליא עלה
למיקריא קאלא דהייא דנישימון וניהיון ולבית הייא ניסקון

»I (Manda dHayye) said before the Great Life: 'This world, into which you *send* me in order to make heard the *Voice of Life*, that *they may hear and live* and ascend to the House of Life . . .'.»

Especially significant in the present connexion is the conception of the process in which life is brought to those who listen to the voice of life. It is a process beginning during earthly life, at the moment when man is awakened from his 'sleep', *i.e.* his insensibility to the spiritual realities, continued after death by the spirit's ascent and having as its final goal the entrance into the 'House of Life'. This corresponds fairly with the Jn-ine idea of the ζωοποίησις.

For the general idea of the Messenger as possessing life and bringing life reference may be made to the passages quoted from *MLi* 134, 196, 199, *GR II* 58^{23} by R. Bultmann.[1]

A close parallel to the expressions of Jn 5 respecting the *derived judge-ship* of J (5^{27}) connected with the idea of deliverance from judgement of those who 'hear the *voice* of the Messenger and believe in him who sent him' (5^{24}) is found in *GR II 3*, quoted in part above pp. 131 and 135 ff. The messenger speaks of himself as 'the Messenger of the Light' *(Šlihā dNhorā)* the King who came from the Light, the truthful messenger *(Šlihā kušṭanā)*, whom the Great One sent into this world *(drabbā šaddran lhāzen ālmā)*. He sends out a voice into the world. Those who hear the voice and believe in the Messenger are not judged, or not condemned, but the Messenger will forgive[1] their sin and guilt. The section ends: »Praise be to thee, O King of Light, who didst send the truth to us, thy friend! Thou wert victorious, O Manda dHayye, and didst make all thy friends victorious. *The Life makes all (its) works victorious (successful).*»[2]

---

[1] in *Die neuerschlossenen mand. und manich. Quellen* etc., pp. 109 f. *MLi* $134^{8,9}$ (*Qolastā* 76)

הייא שרולה בפומה

»(speaking of the Messenger:) Life dwelt in his mouth» *MLi* 196^{7-9} (*Oxf.* I xxvi)

עתית מן בית הייא עתית מאהו דאיתיתלאן איתיתלכון דלאתימיתון ולאניכתאברא
נישמאתכון איתילכין ליום מותא הייא וליומא נסיסא האדוא

»'Thou [O, Messenger] camest from the House of Life. Thou camest; what didst thou bring us?' 'I brought you [the gift] that you shall not die and that your spirit shall not be fettered (imprisoned). I brought you life for the day of death and joy for the sorrowful day.'»

Further, it is to be noticed that in this section, *GR II 3*, the judgement of the unbelievers, in analogy with the conferment of life on the believers, is represented under two aspects: (1) it belongs to the *works* with which the Messenger is commissioned by the Great Life, the judgement in this sense consisting really in a self-judgement of the wicked, in not listening to the Voice (cf. above p. 136), (2) the final judgement is assigned to '*that day, the day of judgement*' which, for a class of *the believers again is the 'hour of deliverance*'. Cf. Jn 5^{29}: καὶ ἐκπορεύσονται οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες εἰς **ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς**, οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες εἰς **ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως**. The 'day of judgement and hour of deliverance' is in *GL I 2*[3] also called 'the great day of *resurrection (qaịamta)*'. With this coheres that there are in Ginza representations of intermediary states both for the wicked and the good[4] between the first and last stages of judgement or obtainment of Life. On this *vide* Brandt, *Mand. Rel.* pp. 72 ff. and below on Jn 14^{2}. Nevertheless, both the judgement and the obtainment of life are evidently viewed as one continuous process.

---

[1] or: cause to be forgiven; cf. above p. 136.

[2] *GR II 3* 61^{1-5} (*Pet* 66^{17-19}):

מישאבית אנאת מאלכא דנהורא דטאדארתלאן ישרארא לראהמאך זכית מאנדא
דהייא וזאכית כולהון ראהמאך והייא זאכין לכולהון עובאדיא

[3] *GL I 2* $437^{21 f.}$ (*Pet* $19^{1 f.}$):

אלמא ליומא יום דינא ואלמא לשיתא ישאייא דפורקאנא אלמא ליומא רבא
דקאיאמתא

'until that day, the day of judgement, and until that hour, the hours of deliverance, until the *great day of resurrection*'.

[4] and also for the intermediate: 'the believing Mandeans that have sinned'. The 'day of judgement' is also termed 'the day of the *End*' (יומא דסוף, *GR IX 1* $225^{1,2}$ *XI* $255^{26 f.}$ e. a.) or 'the *last day*' (יומא באתראיא, cf. above p. 132 l. 27). Cf. Jn 6^{39}, 11^{24} (ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ) and 12^{48} (ὁ λόγος, ὃν ἐλάλησα ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ). On the twofold representations of judgement cf. Bultmann, *Die neuerschlossenen mand. und manich. Quellen etc.* p. 137: »Ebenso (*scil.* as in the Fourth Gospel) steht es in der mandäischen und der verwandten Literatur: auch hier kreuzen sich vielfach zwei Eschatologien, indem zu dem eigentlichen entscheidenden Ereignis, der Predigt des Gesandten, noch die Erwartung einer definitiven Eschatologis tritt, die im allgemeinen nicht so vergeistigt ist wie im Joh.-Ev.»

A characteristic parallel to Jn 5 is found in *GR XI*. Here the Messenger is called the *Son* of his Father; he is the judge, and his judge-ship is justified on the one hand by his being 'like his Father' and on the other hand by being the 'head of the tribe' of the spirits living on earth, *i.e.* men. This is conform to the Jn-ine representation of the son as having obtained the 'authority to execute of judgement' (1) from the Father, (2) 'because he is a son of man'.[1]

---

[1] *GR XI* 256^{24}—257^{6} (*Pet* 256^{12}—257^{9}):

תום קאימינון קדימיא קאדמאייא דמן נאפשה הוא על עותריא תלאתא ובראכינון
וקאימינון וקאיים בריה רחימא פארושא קאדמאיא דמינה הוא ואמארלון לעותריא
עלין תלאתא דבריכתא בראכתינכון דאבאהאתא לבנאיין בראך אזאל לאלמא
האנאתה דאן ואזכון האתאם נישמאתא דמן האכא עתינסיב להאתאם אולונהון
לאלמא האנאתה דהשוכא דמותא בה ואכון (ונפיש) [ואנפיק] נישמאתא מינאיהין
דעקרעייא ושיהיא ׃ הו שותא דהייא נישמון ובמאנדא דהייא ניתקאימון ושותאיכון
דילכון נישמון וניפקון בזיוא ונהורא דמאנדא דהייא וניתקאימון בית הייא ואנאתון
עותריא תלאתא ניהויא היביל אהוכון קאשישא ניהויא אמאר ודאיין דינאיכון
[257^{1} באלמא האנאתה דמן קבאל אהא קשישא אבא הו ניהויא רישא ניהויא
דאיאנא דעלאויא דאיאניא דאלמא האזין וניקרונה האזין אצאצא מנא אתא עלאן
דקאימיא ומשארגזילאן באלמא האזין דילאן דנאפשאן רישא דקינאן באלמא
האזין דשותה צאותה ומינילתה שמעיא ואמארלון קאדמאיא לעותריא תלאתא
תיזלון ותיהאדרולה לשכינתא דמינה נפאקתון מא דהייא שאוילכון היכלא דזיוא
וענדרונא דנהורא ותיפקון בזאכותא כוי עבידאיכון ניהויא שאלימיא

»Then the Primeval, *First one*, who was out of himself, established the three Uthras and blessed them and established them, and established his *beloved son* the Discerner, the First One, who was out of him (the Father), and he said to these three Uthras: 'I blessed you with the blessing with which the parents blessed their children. Go out to that world, *execute judgement* and *deliver* there *from judgement* the spirits that have been taken thither from here. They were brought into that world in which are darkness and *death!* Deliver from judgement and bring out the spirits among them that are called and desired, which *hear the voice of the Life* and are established by Manda dHayye and *hear your voice* and go out in the splendour and light of Manda dHayye and become established (in) the House of Life. On you, three Uthras, Hibil your eldest brother will pronounce judgement, and he will execute your judgement. *For the eldest brother is (as) the Father.* He shall be the head, *he shall be the judge* over the judges of this world. They cry to him: 'Whither has this flint (*i.e.* hard one(s)) come upon us, that stand(s) and rebuke(s) us in this our own world!' [He is] the *head of our tribe* in this world, whose *speech, voice and word are heard.* And the First One speaks to the three Uthras: 'Go out [from that world] and return to the Škina, from which you are gone out, [return to]

Bauer[1] refers to *M. Li* 206 *(Oxf. I xxxviii)* as a parallel to the idea of the function of judge assigned to the son of man:

דזיוה דאב קאיימנא . . . בישיא דזאקפיא אלאנפאי עית גאברא
דמנאנגארלון לאו בהאילאי הינעלא בהאילאיהון דהייא רורביא

»I stand in the splendour of [my] Father . . . the evil ones who raise themselves against me: there is a man who rebukes them; not with my power (they are punished) but with the power of the mighty Life». The 'man' is the Great Life.

To sum up: in Mandaitic Literature the general ideas forming the background of Jn $5^{17\text{ ff.}}$ are pronounced, and frequently attested. The Messenger is sent from the Great Life, the source of all Life. He is entrusted with Life and power emanating from the Great Life. He receives authority from his Father and is commissioned by him to »do the works which his Father commands him». The »works» consist *i. a.* in making the Voice of Life heard in the world and in conferring His Life upon those who listen to his voice. His mission in the world also constitutes a judgement. The grounds for the judgement are from one point of view that the Messenger is of the same 'tribe' as the spirits of earthly man, from the other point of view that he possesses the authority of to execute judgement, »he is as (his) Father».[2]

The same principal ideas occur in the *Odes of Solomon* in a characteristic setting of their own. Thus we find here the conception of the Son, who possesses the Life of the Father within him, has the Spirit in him, and confers life upon those who join him, who listen to his Voice; — pronounced is the notion of the Voice as being proclaimed to, and of the Life as being conferred on, the dead who dwell in Šeol —; of the Son as having obtained authority, dominion and power from the Father; of the Son as the judge, whose appearance is a judgement for those who do not listen to him,

---

that which the Life has procured for you, the Palace of Splendour and the Room of Light. You shall go out victorious, when your *works shall be finished.* (Jn 5^{36}).» Cf. also further below in the same section (*GR XI* 257^{14-20} *Pet* 257^{16-22}) quoted above p. 135: »all the spirits who *believed in* (*the Life* or 'the Father') etc.». It will be noticed that in the passage quoted all the principal expressions and ideas of Jn 5 are represented.

[1] J *Ev*^{2} p. 82.

[2] These two ideas coalesce in the conception of the Messenger's authority as judge depending upon his being the head of the tribe of spirits; he who hears the voice from the Life through the Messenger of his own nature separates himself from this head.

who cannot receive the Word, because they are not of the Truth; of the final judgement or the final conferment of Life upon the believers in the end of time, the new world. It will be well to quote the relevant passages in their proper connexions.

Od Sol III »7 and because I shall love Him that is the Son, I shall become a son; 8 for he that is joined to Him that is immortal will also himself become immortal; 9 and he who has pleasure in life (*or:* in the Living one), will become living».[1]

Od Sol VII »4 He became *like me*, in order that I might receive him: he was reckoned like myself in order that I might put him on . . . 6 *Like my nature* he became that I might learn him, and *like my form*, that I might not turn back from him.» This may be regarded as bearing upon Jn 5 27 b: ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστιν. The Son, whether conferring Life or judging, can do this because he is of the same nature as, is one of, the children of man.

Od Sol IX »1 Open your *ears* and I will speak to you. 2 Give me your souls that I may also give you my soul, 3 the word of the Lord and his good pleasures, the holy thought which he has devised concerning his Messiah. 4 For in the will of the Lord is your life . . . 6 . . . that none of those who *hear* may fall in war, and those again who have known him may not perish.

Od Sol X »6 . . . [Christ speaks:] they walked *in my life* and were saved and became my people for ever and ever».[2]

Od Sol XV » . . . 4 *ears* have become mine and *I have heard* his truth . . . 9 *death has been destroyed* before my face: and Šeol has been abolished by my word: 10 and there has gone up *deathless life* in the Lord's land, and it has been made known to all his faithful ones, and has been given without stint to all those who trust in him».

Od Sol XXII »1 [Christ speaks:] He who brought me down from on high also brought me up from the regions below . . . 4 He who *gave me authority* over bonds that I might loose them»[3] . . . [The believer speaks of Christ:] »7 . . . thy hand has levelled the way for those who believe in thee: 8 and *thou didst choose them from the*

---

[1] R. Harris, *O. Ps. Sol.*, A. Robinson, *Od. Sol.*

ܡܛܠ ܕܐܪܚܡ ܠܗܘ ܒܪܐ ܐܗܘܐ ܒܪܐ. ܗܘ ܓܝܪ
ܕܡܬܢܩܦ ܠܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܐܬ ܐܦ ܗܘ ܕܠܐ ܡܝܘܬܐ ܢܗܘܐ
ܘܗܘ ܕܒܚܝܐ ܡܨܛܒܐ ܚܝܐ ܢܗܘܐ

[2] ܘܗܠܟܘ ܒܚܝܝ ܘܐܬܦܪܩܘ ܘܗܘܘ ܥܡܝ ܠܥܠܡ ܥܠܡܝܢ

[3] ܗܘ ܕܝܗܒ ܠܝ ܫܘܠܛܢܐ ܕܐܣܘܪ̈ܐ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܫܪܐ ܐܢܘܢ

graves and *didst separate them from the dead.* 9 Thou didst take dead bones and didst cover them with bodies; 10 they were motionless, and thou didst give [them] energy for life.»

Od Sol XXIII »... 5 And His (God's) thought was like a Letter; His will descended from on high ... 10 But those who saw it went after the Letter that they might know where it would alight, and who should read it and who should hear it. 11 But a wheel received it and it was coming upon it: 12 and a sign was with it of *Dominion and Government* (ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܘܡܕ̈ܒܪܢܘܬܐ) ... 17 The Letter was one of *command* (ܦܘܩܕܢܐ) ... 18 and there was seen at its head, the *head* which was revealed, even *the Son of Truth from the Most High Father,* 19 and he *inherited and took possession of everything.* (ܝܪܬ ܟܠܡܕܡ ܘܩܢܐ).

Od Sol XXIV »5 and the abysses opened themselves and were hidden ... 7 and they perished, in the thought, those that had existed from ancient times; 8 for they were corrupt from the beginning; and the *end of their corruption was the Life;* 9 and every one of them that was imperfect perished: for it was not possible to give them a *word* that they might remain ... 12 and so they were rejected, because the truth was not with them. 13 For the Lord disclosed His way, and spread abroad His grace: 14 and *those who understood it, know His holiness.*» Here the idea is attested that with the advent of the Life there necessarily follows a judgement and perdition for those who are unable (or unwilling) to receive it. The judgement (and the conferment of life?) is extended also to the underworld, the world of the νεκροί.

Od Sol. XXVIII »5 for I am ready before destruction comes: and I have been set on his incorruptible wings: 6 and *immortal life has come forth* and has kissed me, 7 and *from that life is the spirit within me,* and *it cannot die, for it lives*».[1] Cf. Jn 5 26: ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἔχει ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκεν ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.

Od Sol XXXIII »3 He stood on a lofty summit and uttered *His voice* (ܩܠܗ) from one end of the earth to the other: 4 and drew to him all those who obeyed him; and there did not appear as it were an evil person, 5 but there stood a perfect virgin[2] who was

---

[1] ܡܛܠ ܕܐܬܛܝܒܬ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܚܒܠܐ ܘܐܬܬܣܝܡܬ ܒܓܦܘܗܝ ܕܠܐ ܡܚܒܠܐ. ܘܢܦܩܘ ܚܝܐ
ܕܠܐ ܡܘܬܐ ܘܢܫܩܘܢܝ. ܘܡܢܗܘܢ ܐܝܬܝܗ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܒܝ. ܘܠܐ ܡܫܟܚܐ ܠܡܡܬ ܡܛܠ ܕܚܝܐ ܗ̄ܝ

[2] Probably = Christ's voice, in analogy with the use of the simile of 'virgin' for the 'Wisdom'.

proclaiming and calling and saying: 6 O ye sons of men, come ye . . . 7 and forsake the ways of that corruption and draw near unto me, 8 and *I will enter into you*, and *will bring you forth from perdition*[1] . . . 9 that you be not destroyed nor perish: 10 hear ye me and be redeemed . . . 11 . . . *I am your judge* (ܕܝܢܟܘܢ ܐܢܐ ܐܝܬ); 12 and they who have put me on shall not be injured: but *they shall possess the new world that is incorrupt.*» Notice here the reference to the final eschatology in connexion with the immediate conferment of life, and also that the conferment of life is conjoined with the judgeship of Christ.

Od Sol XXXV »1 . . . the cloud of peace he caused to rise over my head, 2 which *guarded me continually;* it was to me for salvation: 3 all things were shaken and were affrighted; and there came forth from them a smoke and a *judgement;* 4 and *I was at rest in the Lord's commandment*». Cf. Jn 5^{24}: . . . ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται . . . Cf. also the similar words of *Od Sol* XXXVI and XXXVIII.

Od Sol XLI »11 And his *word* is with us in all our way; the *Saviour who makes alive and does not reject our souls*[2], the man who was humbled, and exalted by his own righteousness, the *Son* of the Most High appeared in the *perfection* of His *Father.*»

Od Sol XLII »11 [Christ speaks:] *Šeol* saw me and was made miserable: *Death* cast me up and many along with me. 12 I was gall and bitterness to him, and I went down with him to the utmost of his depths . . . 14 and I *made a congregation of living men amongst his dead men,* and I *spake with them by living lips*[3]*:* because my *word* shall not be void: 15 and those *who had died ran towards me:* and they cried and said, Son of God, have pity on us 16 and do with us according to thy kindness, and bring us out from the bonds of darkness: 17 and open to us the door by which we shall come out to thee . . . 18 Let us also be saved with thee: for thou art our saviour. 19 And I heard their voice . . . 20 and my name I sealed upon their heads: for they are free men and they are mine.»

When turning to Rabbinic parallels to the section, attention must first be called to the clear Rabbinic background for 5^{17}: ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται. The Rabbinic speculations on the continual activity of the Holy One are attached exclusively to the concomitant idea of the Divine Sabbath-rest from the works of Creation (*Gen* $2^{2,3}$ *Exod* 20^{11}). Billerbeck *ad loc*[1] quotes and refers to *Gen R* 10 12, 11 11 *Tanḥ Ki Tissā*, *P*^{e}*siq R* 23, *M*^{e}*k* to 20^{11} (fol. 26c), *Ex R* 30 6. *Gen R* 11 11 and *Ex R* 30 6 are also referred to by Bauer.[2] To the references adduced by Billerbeck may be added also the following:

---

[1] ܘܐܥܠ ܒܟܘܢ ܘܐܦܩܟܘܢ ܡܢ ܐܒܕܢܐ

[2] ܦܪܘܩܐ ܕܡܚܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܣܠܐ ܠܢ̈ܦܫܢ

[3] Cf. Jn 5^{25} . . . οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσωσι τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.

M^{e}*k* 37 b (to 31^{17})

שבת וינפש ממה שבת מן העבודה או מן הדין תלמוד לומר וינפש
מגיד שאין הדין בטל מלפניו לעולם וכן הוא אומר צדק ומשפט
מכון כסאך חסד ואמת יקדמו פניך ואומר הצור תמים פעלו כי כל
דרכיו משפט וגו'

»'[...in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day] he rested and was refreshed. (*Exod* 31^{17})'. From what did he rest? From [his] work [with the Creation] or from judgement [*i.e.* from his work as judge]? The Scripture says 'and was refreshed' (*scil.* for new work], teaching that judgement does not cease before him for ever. And in the same sense it says: '(*Ps* 89^{14}) Justice and judgement are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face', and it says: '(*Deut.* 32^{4}) The Rock [*i.e.* the Holy One], his work is perfect, for all his ways are judgement etc.'»

It might safely be assumed that Jn 5^{17} is based upon the Jewish notion of the relation of the Holy One to the Sabbath. It calls attention to the accepted truth that God, although as regards 'physical' work he himself observes the Sabbath commandment, yet as regards the works of judgement is continually active from the beginning of time unto eternity. The latter part of the vs., κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι, then, expresses that J stands in the same relation to the Sabbath as God and is continually active in the same work as his Father, namely that of judgement, implying (in analogy with the dictum of *Gen R* 11 11[3]) punishment or condemnation of the wicked and conferment of life on the believers. From this it becomes clear that 5^{17} on the one hand belongs intrinsically to the narrative portion $5^{2\,\text{ff.}}$, treating of the healing on the Sabbath, but on the other hand introduces, or gives occasion to, the subject of the discourse: J doing the Divine work of conferring life and executing judgement. At the same time it serves to bring into clear light the main point of attack from the side of the Jews: when J said: κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι, this implied truly that, as vs. 18 expresses it: οὐ μόνον ἔλυεν τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγον τὸν θεόν, in the sense of ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῶ θεῷ. This point also is taken up by the following discourse which, consequently, treats of the relation between the Father and the Son, i. e. forms itself into a Christological sprech.[1]

---

[1] ii p. 461 f.

[2] *J Ev*^{2} p. 78, 79.

[3] God's work is concerned with פורענותן של רשעים, the retribution of the wicked, and שכרן של צדיקים, the remuneration of the righteous.

With regard to the continuity of thought between vss. 17, 18 and the inceptive argument of the discourse, it is important to note that the consecutive force of the argument is best explained from the background of current Rabbinic modes of thought. Thus the formula ἴσον ποιεῖ ἑαυτὸν τῷ θεῷ corresponds exactly to the Rabbinic expression מַשוה את עצמו לאלהים which to a Rabbinic ear is equivalent to 'makes himself independent of God', *i.e.* by usurping for himself the Divine power and authority; the expression, in the Rabbinic sense, implies some degree of 'rebellion' against the Divine government. A son who rejects the paternal authority is characterized as who מַשוה עצמו לאביו, 'makes himself equal with his Father'.[2] From the Rabbinic point of view the profanation of the Holy One which inhered in the words of J in vs. 17 consisted not in his calling the Holy One his Father, but in his presuming upon a peculiar sonship in virtue of which he had the right of performing the same 'continual work' as his Father. This was a blasphemy, equivalent to saying 'I am equal with, 'as good as', my Father'.

Against this interpretation of the words of J, vs. 19 declares: ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν, ἐὰν μή τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα. ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποεῖ. ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ, ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ. This is exactly how one versed in Rabbinic thought would try to make his compeers understand the relation between the Father and the Son. The expressions reflect, as has been pointed out already by Schlatter[3], characteristic Rabbinic thought and language. The point of the argument is: The Son does *not*

---

[1] These considerations only serve to strengthen the usual interpretation of the concluding vss. of the narrative postion of Jn 5. Cf. *e. g.* Loisy and Bauer *ad loc.*

[2] *Gr R.* 76 *SH* 28 b O. a. s. p. 136.

[3] *Spr. u. Heim. d. vierten Ev.* pp. 357 f.

'make himself equal with' the Father, he does not presume upon an independent authority. On the contrary, all his authority is derived from his father. He is not a rebellious son, a blasphemer of the Divine Father; on the contrary, his peculiar opposition is justified by his being and acting in absolute unity of intention and thought with his father. His continual activity is not independent of the Father's activity; on the contrary, he does the Father's works, he executes what the Father shows him, and commands him to do.

A parallel to the Jn-ine picture of the relation between the Father and the Son is found in the representation in *3 Enoch* of the mutual relation between the Holy One and Metatron.

Thus, in the 1st century fragments contained in *3 En* the following suggestive traits appear:

(1) The Holy One *shows* (הראה), teaches (הורה) and reveals (גלה) to Metatron all secrets (רזים) and all *works* (מעשים): *3 En* 48 C ^{20}, 11 $^{1-3}$ [cf. Jn 5 ^{20} πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ]. Metatron watches intently 'to behold' what the Holy One shows him: *3 En* 11 ^{2} [cf. Jn 5 ^{19}: ἐὰν μή τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα].

(2) »Whatever word and whatever utterance goes forth from before the Holy One, Metatron . . . carries it out.» *3 En* 48 C ^{10} cf. Jn 8 ^{28} καθὼς ἐδίδαξέν με ὁ πατήρ, ταῦτα λαλῶ.

(3) The Holy One gives Metatron the authority of judgement, he commissions him with the דין, ('judgement and government') saying: 'Every angel and every prince who has a word to speak in my presence shall go into his (Metatron's) presence and shall speak to him instead. And every command that he utters to you in my name, do ye observe and fulfil!' [*3 En* 10 ^{4,5}]. Metatron receives authority to »abase by his word the proud to the ground, and to exalt by the utterance of his lips the humble to the height, to smite kings by his speech, to turn kings away from their paths, to set up rulers over their dominions [*3 En* 48 C ^{10}] cf. Jn 5 ^{23}: οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκεν τῷ υἱῷ.

(4) Metatron performs the 'continual work' of the Holy One, on his authority. *3 En* 48 C ^{11}. He distributes 'Greatness, Kingship, Dignity, Rulership, Honour and Praise and Diadem and Crown of Glory' and 'maintenance': *3 En* 16 ^{1}. A remnant of this tradition is also found in *TB ʿAb. Zarā* 5 a.

(5) Acc. to mystical traditions attested in later literature Metatron has the function of taking care of and conferring eternal life upon the spirits of the deceased.

(6) It is strongly emphasized that all his authority is conferred upon him by the Holy One: he does not do his own will, but the will of the Holy One: *3 En* 16. Cf. Jn 5^{30} οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν . . . οὐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με.

This shows that in the 1st and 2nd centuries there were circles even within Palestinian Judaism who preserved and developed the idea, already attested in *1 En*[1], of a partaker in the Divine work, especially that of judgement. What is important is that in these circles, in analogy with what is found also in Mandaitic literature, this partaker is no longer pictured as a figure of the 'time to come', but as functioning already in the present. Since it can be shown with some certainty that the ideas of these circles were not unknown to the leading Rabbinic teachers, who determined the development of later rabbinic orthodoxy, but on the contrary were vehemently repressed by them[2], it may be assumed as highly probable that Jn $5^{19, 20, 22}$ try to make the Christological teaching understandable by linking it up with the conceptions in question.

With respect to the elaborations on the subject following in Jn $5^{20, 23\,\text{ff.}}$ it is apposite to call attention to a few other details in the current representations of the partaker in the Divine work.

(1) The Divinely-appointed judge has to do with Life and Death. He executes the Divine functions expressed by the words 'Yhuh killeth and maketh alive, he bringeth down to Šeol and bringeth up again' ה' ממית ומחיה מוריד שאול ויעל.[3] One may also compare the way in which the highest two figures in the angelic hierarchy acc. to the angelological system preserved in *3 En* 18 are called *Soferiel Yhuh mēmiṯ* and *Soferiel Ihuh mᵉḥayyæ* (Soferiel Ihuh who maketh alive).[4] It is easy to trace here the conception of a being, a 'son', who 'by authority of *Māqōm*'[5] 'maketh dead and maketh alive'. Hence it might not have been any startling novelty

---

[1] Namely in the 'Book of Similitudes'; vide esp. *1 En* $46^{4,5}$ (»this Son of Man . . . shall raise up the kings and the mighty from their seats . . . and shall loosen the reins of the strong . . . shall put down kings from their thrones and kingdoms»), *1 En* 51^{3} (»the Elect One shall in those days sit on my (variant: his) throne, and his mouth shall pour forth all the secrets of wisdom . . . For the Lord of spirits hath given them to him»), *1 En* 45^{3}, 55^{4}, 61^{8}, $62^{2\,\text{ff.}}$, $69^{27, 29}$.

[2] cf. the writer's *3 En*, Introd. sect. 8.

[3] *1 Sam* 2^{6}, LXX: Κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ, κατάγει εἰς ᾅδου καὶ ἀνάγει, cf. *2 Ki* 5^{7} LXX: ὁ θεὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ θανατῶσαι καὶ ζωοποιῆσαι.

[4] *3 En* $18^{23,24}$.

[5] An early name of the Deity. *3 En* 18^{24}.

even to Jewish ears when Jn 5^{21} says: 'ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοποιεῖ, οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱός, οὓς θέλει, ζωοποιεῖ, especially when considering that οὓς θέλει simply means οὓς θέλει ὁ πατήρ [ζωοποιῆσαι]. (2) the special way in which the Divine vice-regent or partaker in the Divine work is attached to the Holy One is expressed by the special sense in which general epithets of the Holy One are used by this partaker, and in which Divine names are assigned to him. In this respect the earlier Jewish mystical traditions seem to have gone farther even than Jn. Thus, when in addressing Metatron, the Holy One is called 'thy begetter', *(gonăkā)*[1], this evidently carries quite another significance than when the phrase is used of man in general. It is meant to express that he has received all the Divine functions with regard to the angelic and terrestrial worlds. With this may be compared how, acc. to Jn 5^{18}, the ὁ πατήρ μου in the mouth of J was by the Jews understood as used in a specific sense: ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι ὅτι . . . *πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγεν τὸν θεόν*. Similarly when Metatron is called '*the little I̮hụḫ*' this constitutes a specific relation between the Holy One and his vice-regent; it expresses that he is, '*mĕʿēn*', 'a reflexion of', 'in unity with', and 'similar to' the Holy One.[2] The term '*the little I̮hụḫ*' is in its import widely different from the epithet 'I̮hụḫ' carried by high angelic beings, and even by Messiah.[3] (3) The partaker in the Divine work, the carrier of the Divine functions is able to be a judge-testifier, because he has once lived the life of a terrestrial being, because he is a son of (wo)man. In this aspect he is called 'child' or 'youth'. Thus acc. to *3 En* Metatron is called 'child, (*Naʿar*, youth)' because he is Enoch, the son of Jared.[4] The underlying idea is here, as in Mand., identical with that of Jn 5^{27}: ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστιν.[5]

---

[1] *3 En* 4^{1,9}.

[2] *3 En* 12^{4}, cf. 11^{1}, 10^{1}.

[3] *Lam R* to 1^{16}; *3 En* 18$^{9 \text{ ff.}}$

[4] *3 En* 4^{2,10}.

[5] It may be argued that 'youth', 'child', נַעַר, in Jewish mystical thought really stands for the sum representative of the spiritual beings who have taken up earthly existence. This is corroborated by a comparison with the Mandæan conception of the 'youthful child' רביא טליא. Cf. references in the writer's *3 En*, Introd. pp. 68 f. In relation to the Deity this 'youth' is the 'son' in a specific sense, the 'Unique One' (cf. *op. cit.* pp. 68, 83), in relation to the human world, he is a son of man. This corresponds to the personal identity between the 'son of God' and the 'son of man' in Jn.

It is a strange fact that there is in Rabbinical and earlier Jewish mystical literature no real parallel to the conception of the 'voice' as occurring in Jn 5. The conception of the echo of the Divine voice, termed *'Băþ Qōl'*, the daughter of the voice, might perhaps be recalled in connexion with 5^{37}, cf. below. The idea of the 'voice' as implying the advent of the spiritual into the earthly world, bringing life to those who receive it, who 'listen to the voice', is, however, not attested. Whether this is to be explained as an evasion of an expression or conception prominent among opposed circles (in analogy with the evasion of the terms 'son' and 'son of man'[1]), or simply as an indication of unfamiliarity with the idea, cannot be decided with any certainty. It is remarkable, though, that the midrashic expositions never make any allegorical use of the numerous O.T. passages referring to the 'hearing of the voice of Ihuh' (e.g. *Gen* 7^{7}, *Dt* 5^{22,23,25}, 18^{16}, *Isa* 6^{8}, 50^{10}, 66^{6}, *Ps* 29^{3,4,5,7,8,9}, *Dan* 8^{16}, 9^{10,11,14}, 10^{9}). »Hearing the voice» is in the *M^ekilta* equivalent to »obeying the command»[2], without any deeper significance.

A more mystical connotation adheres to the 'hearing the voice' in the Samaritan traditions. Thus we find in

Asfar F^{e}liata elMarqa, 181 a b

יתרבי נביה מהימנה משה איש האלהים דאלפין מה דאלפה אלה
כותה לא קם ולא יקום נביה רבה [כ]משה דאתי מן בכסיהתה
ובגליאתה ומרי אמר בדילה ולא קם עורי בישראל כותה מן יכל
יהלפנה אלפן הייה ואזהר יתן מן כותה נשמע בקלה אמלי נתיההי
אקימן על קשטה יקיאמן עליו. והכמן שקהרן והזהרן מנה נגד יתן
בשביל פציתה יהחקן מן שביל אבדנה נשמע למליו דהייה לגוה
ונטרין כי קימתהתה בון מליו כסמן מאסי לכל מטאנין מן קבל
מנה לא יקצבנה באש.

»Exalted be the faithful prophet, Moses, the man of God, who taught what God taught him (cf. Jn 8^{28} καθὼς ἐδίδαξέν με ὁ πατήρ, ταῦτα λαλῶ). Like unto him there did not arise [anyone], and there will not arise a great prophet like unto Moses who came from

---

[1] Cf. the writer's *3 En*, Introd. § 7 a.

[2] *M^{e}k* 24 a *l.* 18: ועתה אם שמוע תשמע בקולי (*Exod* 19^{5}) ועתה קבלו עליכם שכל התחלות קשות אם שמוע תשמעו מכאן אמרו שמע מצוה אחת משמיעין לו מצות הרבה

(*i.e.* understood) both the secret things and the revealed things. And for his sake the Lord said: (*Deut* 34^{10}) 'And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses'. Who can change (pervert) the teaching (doctrine) of Life? And he warned us (against it). Who is like him? *Let us hear his voice that we may live!* He established us on the truth and we will remain established on it, and then we will recognize their lies and beware of them. *He leads us on the way of deliverance* and keeps us away from the way of perdition. *Let us listen to his words, for in them is life;* and let us guard (treasure) them, for our preservation is in them. His words are as oil, a healing for all our wounds. He who receives from him, him no evil can reach.» Thus the 'voice of the prophet' is connected with the obtainment of life. Attention might also be called to

Asfar F^{e}liata 9^a, 11

אגיב משה למריה בתר כל אלין מליה דשמע אם לא יאמני לי ולא
יקבלו לקלי מה הו סימנה דאנה מעמי לון... [11^a] אם לא יימנון הדן
דאקרי היל מנין עבד קמיהון... פליאן רברבאן מזועין כל לבביה
לית לאנש יעבדנון אלא א״ת דאתה היא תניאנה בעלמה דלרע

»Moses answered his Lord after all this words which he had heard: 'If they do not believe me and *do not receive my voice*, what shall be the sign that I shall show them'. — [Thereupon God shows Moses signs or works to be done by him, and says:] 'If they do not believe in these [works that I have shown thee], thou shalt do *greater ones than these before them* ... great wonders shake all their hearts. There is none who will be able to do similar works, save thou, for thou art the 'second one' in the world below.» Cf. Jn 5^{20} ὁ . . . πατὴρ . . . πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ . . . καὶ μείζονα τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαυμάζητε. Cf. also the references to the expression 'voicing a call' (כרז בקל רם, קעם וכרז), given below on 7^{37}.

It may be possible to see in the Samaritan passages quoted an evidence that the expressions relating to the 'voice of the Messenger' or the 'prophet' were so fixed in certain circles outside, but nearly related to, Rabbinic Judaism, that the technical or symbolical use of this term did not commend itself to the Rabbinic teachers. Jn, on the other hand, felt no objection against this use, but, on the contrary, moved congenially in the language of the extra Rabbinical circles. In view of the position taken in ch. 4, it would indeed be in no way surprising if Jn would be shown even in ch. 5 to link up with Samaritan traditions in contraposition to Judaic ones.

The weightiest problem of the present section still to be approached is that of the bearing of vss. 24—29 on the ideas centering round the conception of immortality or, more adequately, of the obtainment by the 'dead' of eternal life. The problem may be put simply thus: *at what stage of his existence does the believer step out from perishable into imperishable life?* Speaking in terms of current mystic or gnostic thought one might face three different possibilities: (a) the eternal life may be brought to man during his earthly existence: he may pass directly from earthly, mortal existence into the highest spiritual life, from sleep to wakefulness; when leaving earthly existence, dying physically, he wakes up to full enjoyment of eternal life in his spiritual home; (b) he may fail to take this direct step, to »ascend to heaven» during his earthly existence; after death he enters the intermediate state of the »dead»[1], the state expressed e.g. in *Od. Sol.* by the *O.T.* term »Š^{e}'ol»; while in this state, he may, however, at some earlier or later time after his earthly death, obtain »eternal life», enter into »spiritual», »heavenly», or »divine», life. (c) The obtainment of eternal life may be related to a definite eschatological event, viz. that of »final consummation»; in this case the object of speculation is the totality of individuals who have experienced earthly life, either with or without subsequent intermediate existence in the world of the »dead».

Now it is evident that in vss. 24—29 there are three different pronouncements on the obtainment of eternal life, viz. vs. 24 *(A)*, vs. 25 *(B)* and vss. 28 f. *(C)*. Moreover, those three pronouncements may be correlated with the three different stages of transition from perishable into imperishable life mentioned above. Thus, it might be maintained, *A* speaks of a transition from mortal into immortal, *i.e.* divine-spiritual, life beginning already during earthly existence, *B* refers to the conferment of such divine life on men who have passed from earthly existence into the intermediate state of the 'dead' — a conferment of life, which forms part of the Son's present and *continuous* activity, thereby distinguished from *C*, which refers to the *future*, the final consummation.

---

[1] It should be unnecessary to point out that the word 'dead' is not to be taken in any sense, implying annihilation of personality, individuality or consciousness; the dead »think», »feel», »hear».

This interpretation of the present context, which is, so far, merely hypothetical, although supported by contemporary and affinited mystical terms and conceptions, will, it is hoped, be seen to accord with the Jn-ine system quite as well as other interpretations, be they orthodox or 'modern'. The main *crux interpretum*, viz. the apparent contradiction between the conceptions of vss. 21—27 and vss. 28, 29 is here removed.[1] The interpretation, further, falls in very naturally with the finer details of expression, especially with the subtle way, in which *B* is at the same time connected with and differentiated from *A* and *C*: with *A* it is connected through the common incipient form ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, and through its relation to the present time, with *C* again it is conjoined by the common phrase ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα and the focus on a post-terrestrial state. The difference between *B* and *C*, viz. the absence in *C* of καὶ νῦν ἐστιν and the mention of the »graves», is generally recognized as implying two different situations in *B* and *C*. Likewise is the connexion between *A* and *B* commonly accepted. Not so, however, the evident connexion between *B* and *C*, nor the difference between *A* and *B*; the latter, therefore, need special consideration. The difference between *A* and *B* may be said to centre in the phrase ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν of vs. 24. The emphasis in this phrase is, not simply on the experience of transition, but on the *immediateness* of transition, on transition *without any intermediate stage.* Hence the 'death' here spoken of is not equivalent with 'mortal existence' or 'quality of mortality', nor, to be sure, with 'spiritual death', but refers simply to the event of physical death. The import, thus, is identical with that of Jn $11^{25,26}$: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The believer, in whom the eternal life has begun already during earthly life, passes at the moment of physical death directly into continued eternal life, and thereby — that is the point — escapes the state of being 'dead', does not enter into the condition of the νεκροί — In *B* the situation is different. The leading expressions are here, in regard to *A*, the ἔρχεται ὥρα and οἱ νεκροί.

---

[1] The only difficulty remaining is the somewhat un-Johannine contrast between οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες and οἱ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες. The genuinely Johannine contrast is that expressed Jn $3^{20,21}$ ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν v. ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων. But, on the other hand, there is no necessity for the writer in this context to emphasize his peculiar terminology; just as he uses the current word ἀνάστασις so he makes use of the likewise current ἀγαθὰ πράξαντες.

The Son's activity includes also the νεκροί, but these are not the 'spiritually dead' among earthly men. The νεκροί are those who have not been able to pass directly from earthly death into real divine-spiritual life; this is conveyed by the ἔρχεται ὥρα pointing to the post-terrestrial existence — to the 'hereafter', which is obviously referred to in *C*, where the same phrase is used. The vivification of the »dead» in *B* is, on the other hand, *not* identical with the ἀνάστασις ζωῆς of *C*, the final consummation of the 'last day'. This is expressly indicated by the addition 'καὶ νῦν ἐστιν'.[1]

As regards the connexion between *A* and *B* on one hand with *C* on the other it may be said to represent the (essential) continuity of the ζωοποίησις from the inceptive stage — which is, indeed, determinative —, treated of in *A* and *B*, to the final fulfilment, described, under the traditional term ἀνάστασις, in *C*.

---

[1] Cf. also the use of νεκροί in vs. 22. — Note Büchsel's observation (*Joh. u. d. hell. Synkret.*, p. 55): »Ferner, für das echte Judentum ist das ewige Leben geknüpft an die Auferstehung der Toten. Auch Johannes erwartet eine Auferstehung der Toten. *Der Gedanke einer Unsterblichkeit der Seele liegt Johannes augenscheinlich ganz fern.* Das ist um so bedeutsamer, als es schon vor Johannes ein Judentum gab, das an die Unsterblichkeit der Seele glaubte. Johannes ist an diesem Punkte von der Verbindung von Judentum und Platonismus ganz unberührt, wie sie in der Weishet Salomos und bei Philon vorliegt. Der Untergrund seiner Anschauung vom Leben ist das palästinensiche, nicht das alexandrinische, hellenistisch verseuchte Judentum.» (*Ib.* n. 1:) »ζωὴ αἰώνιος entspricht jüdischen, hebräischen wie aramäischen Formeln.» With this the present writer so far agrees, as acc. to Jn, »immortality» or »eternal life» really carries the associations of »*ḥai̯i̯ē ʿōlām*» more than those adhering to the conceptions in their Greek, Hellenistic and, by the way, modern sense. Immortality, eternal life, is not a quality pertaining to the 'soul' *per se,* it is a life to be acquired by, or given to, man, and this is not mere ceaseless conscious existence, but conscious existence on a particular stage, or, better, in a particular world viz. the Divine world. Eternal life = Divine Life, the Life that the 'Father has *in* Himself and has given to the Son to have in Himself' (Jn 5^{26}). One might perhaps reproduce Jn's position thus: a man may live, (if to live is = exist consciously), eternally, *i.e.* endlessly, without ever obtaining Eternal Life, or *theoretically,* he may pass through an indefinite series of existences, (such as earthly existence, followed by existences in the post-terrestrial state) without »having Life». The Eternal Life, thus, acc. to Jn, may be said to be constitutively linked up with Man's soul, or rather, spirit, only in so far as that Life is his *true* life. The Mandæan conception is, indeed, similar: The Deity, significantly, is itself named 'Life', *Hai̯i̯ē*, the 'Great Life', *Hai̯i̯ē Rabbē.* On the other hand the spirit's constitutive participation of the Divine Life is more pronounced in *Mand.*: man's spirit is called, *i.a.*, 'a *Mānā* of the Great Life'. In Jn the emphasis is on the other-ness of the Eternal, Divine, Life from every other form of existence. Cf. Lindblom, *Das Ewige Leben,* pp. 221—235.

The same applies, correspondingly, to the sphere of judgement, κρίσις, as also belonging to the Son's activity. For each stage of obtainment of eternal life through the Son's activity there is a corresponding stage of failure to obtain that life, a failure which involves a judgement. This correspondence is expressed thrice in the section vss. 24—29, viz. (1) ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, vs. 24, (2) οὕτως καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἔδωκεν ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῳ. καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, vss. 26, 27, (3) εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς . . . εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως, vs. 29. Hence, it may be urged, there are three main stages of judgement, (1) during earthly life: 'he that believeth not is condemned already' [Jn 3^{18}], (2) the intermediate stage of the νεκροί: being νεκρός is itself a κρίσις in relation to the Son and the eternal life, (3) the ἀνάστασις κρίσεως. At the same time there is an essential unity and continuity of the judgement; the ἀνάστασις κρίσεως is the final completion of the 'present' κρίσις.[1]

The interpretation here vindicated for Jn 5^{25}, it is well recognized, will seem far-fetched both to orthodox and to modern, »free» exegesis. But, surely, our task is not to overcome difficulties which have arisen through an age-long amalganation of Jn-ine thought with more or less traditional views. Our object is not to demonstrate that the passage in question can be understood, as here set forth, by a present-day reader, but, instead, to point out that it would easily be so understood by the circle and at the time to and in which it was written. That this would be the case with a circle familiar with writings and ideas of the type represented by and in the Odes of Solomon, the Mandæan scriptures and similar literature now a days so frequently adduced for the understanding of Jn, needs, so it is hoped, no further proof. But even if we limit ourselves to Jewish sources from a period before, contemporary with and after the approximate time of Jn, we shall easily find ourselves confronted with similar ideas and modes of expression. The different ideas concerning death, judgement, intermediate state of the dead and final consummation found in the various writings classed together under the term of Pseudepigrapha, are sufficiently well-known to be merely reminded of here. Though no uniform doctrine is represented by these writings, the problems and terms in question are frequently recurring.[1] Of special importance in this connexion are, of course, the facts (1) that the question of the intermediate state of the dead between eartly life and the »great day of judgement» was a real problem, for which different solutions were offered, (2) that we already in the Pseudepigraphic writings find traces of the idea that this intermediate state affords special opportunities for those who have failed in earthly life and yet are not wholly corrupt, (3) that the term 'judgement' is used in connexion with all the three stages (earthly life, intermediate state, last day) in an actual interrelation, mutually and with the obtainment of life.[2] These problems and ideas obtain in the following period, as may be seen both from Rabbinic and Jewish mystical sources. In these sources it is possible to discern a development of ideas which brings us to a very close parallel to the conception of *Jn* $5^{24—29}$. Thus (1) to *A* corresponds the notion that a certain class of men, in Rabbinic termed the 'righteous', *ṣaddiqim,* — in Jewish mystical sources possibly also 'the men of faith'[3] — who pass from earthly life directly into Divine Life[4], (2) to *B* corresponds in particular the conception of the fate of the so-called intermediate class (the *bēnōnii̯i̯im*, *i.e.* neither wholly righteous or wholly wicked); these are, either together with or apart from the wholly wicked, 'judged' immediately after death and confined to an intermediate abode, sometimes identified with *Š*$^{e\prime}$*ol,* sometimes with Gehenna; here they are deprived of Divine Life, but they may, through intensive prayer, or after a certain purgatory period, be brought out from this intermediate abode and made participants of the life of the spirits of the righteous, *i.e.* of Divine Life[1], (3) to *C* corresponds the conception of the »Last Day» the »Time to Come»[2], the day of 'resurrection'[3] (Jn: ἀνάστασις) in which all men[4] are involved; this day is for the wicked (Jn: οἱ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες) essentially a day of final judgement (Jn: εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως), for the others again, the day of the great renewal, the beginning of a new age[5], the age of complete Divine, Life (Jn: εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς).[6]

---

[1] Thus, in a similar vein, Bauer *(Joh. Ev.*^{2}, pp. 83, 84 *ad locum):* »(Jn) sah wohl . . . in der ζωοποίησις einen einheitlichen Prozess, den der Mensch nach seiner inneren wie äusseren Seite unterliegt . . . Die leibliche Erweckung ist das letzte Glied der Belebung überhaupt, so wie das Gericht am Jüngsten Tage (5^{29}, 12^{48}, 1 Jn 4^{17}) den feierlichen Abschluss der schon von dem irdischen Herrn über die Menschheit gebrachten κρίσις bildet. Dem entsprechend (sollen) . . . die Genitive ζωῆς und κρίσεως . . . die ἀνάστασις als eine solche charakterisieren, wie sie dem bereits vorhandenen Leben, dem schon vollzogenen Gericht entspricht.»

---

[1] For more elaborate discussions *vide* R. H. Charles, *Eschatology,* G. F. Moore, *Judaism,* ii, pp. 300—308 and the admirable exposition of the various ideas and expressions concerning Š$^{e\prime}$ol, Gehinnōm, Gan ʿEden, ressurection and judgement, by Billerbeck in vol iv, pp. 1016—1212.

[2] *Vide* especially *1 Enoch* ch. 22. — It will be borne in mind that the 'Son of Man' plays an inportant part in the different stages of judgement, acc. to *1 Enoch* chh. 45—57. It will further be remembered, that the consummation of the fate of the 'dead' in the intermediate state is frequently coached in terms exactly parallel or identical with these of Jn 5^{29}, cf. *e.g.* *1 Enoch* $20^{3\,\mathrm{ff.}}$, 22^{13}. See also *Testament of Abraham,* ed. G. H. Box, p. xxiv, xxv, 23, 24.

[3] *3 Enoch* 48 D.

[4] The »spirits of the righteous» at the time of death pass directly to *ʿArāƀop̄,* the highest heaven, the abode of the Holy one (*T.B. Ḥ*^{a}*ḡiḡā* 12 b), they »return to their Creator» (*3 En* 42). Cf. the expression »destined to eternal life» or »to the life of the world to come» below on 8^{51}.

The final question to be put is: in what relation does Jn stand to the various known circles or systems of religious thought with regard to the ideas of judgement and eternal life as revealed in Jn 5^{24-29}? Can he be said to move, wholly or mainly, within any one of those circles? The answer seems to be obvious:

(1) With regard to language, terms, expressions, used, or problems treated, it may safely be stated that, on the whole, Jn 5^{24-30} is most akin to Jewish, early Rabbinic, terminology. The section, it is true, makes use of two single terms which are foreign to the Rabbinic terminology, as far as it is known, viz. those of the »Voice» and the »Son of God», terms, which are familiar to other circles. Yet, there is no doubt but that the large proportion of terms used and the contiguity of the statements best fit in with Rabbinic modes of reasoning and assertion.

(2) With regard to the inner meaning (roughly speaking: the doctrine) conveyed, on the other hand, it must be urged that Jn moves in a sphere far removed from the Rabbinic world of ideas. The situation in this respect might perhaps be best pictured by one of the two suppositions following viz. (1) either that Jn, himself completely familiar with, brought up in, Rabbinic Jewish

---

[1] *3 En* 44, 45. *Tos. Sanh.* 13_3. *TB. Rōš-haš-Šānā* 16 b—17 a.

[2] [ל]עתיד לבוא, freqq. (יום האחרון, »the last day», is not frequent in Rabb.)

[3] תחיית המתים freqq. (Aram. קימתא; Mand. קאיאמתא.)

[4] On this point there is a consensus of *Tannaitic* opinion, *vide Tos Sanh.* 13_3 *T.B.R.H.* 16 b, *Sifrē* 58 d (232), *TB Sanh.* 91 b. The two well-known statements by Josephus concerning the opinions of the Pharisees on resurrection (*Bell. Jud.* ii 8_{14} § 163 and *Antiqu.* xviii 1_3 § 14) are somewhat misrepresented by Bauer (*ad. loc.* p. 84). In reality Josephus makes the Pharisees hold that only the good receive the complete life, with body and soul, the bad again are judged and confined to everlasting punishment and imprisonment.

[5] עולם הבא freqq. עלמא עלאה, עלמא דאתי.

[6] Numerous references could be given. *Vide* especially *M. Sanheðrin* 10_1, *TB. Sanheðrin* 90 ff., *Tanḥuma* (ed. Buber), U̯ai̯i̯iqrā 12, *Meḵ.*, *Bešallaḥ*, Širā 2, *Lev. R.* 4_5.

learning and schools of thought, tries to convey to Rabbinic readers, by using their terms and language, a doctrine, yea, a spiritual reality altogether different from their world of thought (2) or else that Jn addresses himself to readers who, although sharing the terms and language of Rabbinic religious thought, belong to a circle different from normative Rabbinic Judaism.

Starting from this pair of possibilities one is led to the further question, whether the doctrine, or the spiritual vantage-point, (or as some would say, the 'mythology') forming the inner meaning that Jn tries to convey by near-Rabbinic terms, may be urged to be related, more or less closely, to any known religious circle. Where do we find a system of ideas which is identical with or bears close resemblance to the inner meaning of Jn 5 24—30? For an answer to this question one naturally, in accordance with the present trend of research, resorts to Gnostic, Hermetic, Manichæan and Mandæan, possibly also Samaritan-mystical and Jewish-mystical instances. In neither of these instances we meet with a doctrine *identical* with that of Jn. With respect to affinities, however, it should be agreed that such exist, and, further, that the affinities of inner meaning are perhaps greatest between Jn and Mandæan literature, between which there is also a certain community of terminology. A reader of Mandæan literature, who is sensitive to expressions of religious experience, will easily find that this literature, especially the finest poetical parts of the *Ginzā* and the *Mandæan Liturgies*, breathes an atmosphere much more akin to Jn than the early Rabbinical sources. One might perhaps call this atmosphere 'mystical', but since this has become so general a term it might be appropriate to use the qualification 'salvation-mystical', without, however, by that term implying, *a priori*, any theory as to origin (*e.g.* Iranian) nor any allusion to a definite salvation-'*mythology*'.[1] If, then, we call the religious atmosphere of Jn »the Johannine (Christian) salvation-mysticism» it might be said that *the Johannine salvation-mysticism uses an idiom which is most nearly related to the Rabbinic style and terminology*.

It is significant (1) that in the scanty sources of early Samaritan and Jewish Mysticism or Gnosticism we meet with a similar salvation-mysticism, (2) that we are actually able to demonstrate that there existed already in the first and second centuries A. D., in the Judaism that moved within the folds of Rabbinic tradition, several circles of a salvation-mystical character, and (3) that some of these, in ideas and expressions, were more closely bound up with *Mandæan* mysticism than with any other known mystical religious formation outside Judaism.[1] Certainly Jn cannot be maintained to be identical with or to have developed from any of these and still less from Rabbinic circles —, but the sources in question afford parallel phenomena to Jn and make it possible to discern the approximate position of Jn in relation to Palestinian mysticism. The preceding investigations especially on the discourse sections of Jn 3—5, will it may be urged, have tended towards a solution of the problems of such relation on the line of the hypotheses given above on p. 214 f. They will have been seen to apply not only to the ideas of Judgement and Eternal Life (Jn 5 20—29) but to the world of ideas of Jn as a whole, as far as it is revealed in chh. 3—5. As an open question which still has to be settled there remains the problem, whether Jn has any special and intentional address to »normative» Rabbinic Judaism, such as is found, beyond dispute, *e.g.* in the Pauline literature. Such an address we have, hitherto, been inclined to detect in some of the controversial parts of the Jn-ine discourses. The question will be kept in view in the course of the following investigations.

---

[1] The present writer objects to the term 'mythology', since this term is apt to veil the fact, that we have to do, in the sources named, with clear traces of an original and genuine religious experience. The term 'mysticism' is better suited to convey this last-named fact. The mythology is a secondary accretion.

---

[1] This the present writer believes to have sufficiently demonstrated in his *3 Enoch, Introd.* pp. 64—79.

5^{30-47}. The section 5^{30-47} is a typical *coda*-section, of the same category as 3^{22-36} in relation to 3^{3-21} and 4^{31-42} in relation to 4^{7-30}. Like these it takes recourse to a new idea in order to bring the spiritual reality, treated of in the preceding, under a new aspect. The new conception used here is that of the *testimony*, the μαρτυρία.

It is the merit of Lindblom to have pointed out what an important part the conception of 'the testimony', μαρτυρία, plays in Jn. He lays stress on J's function as *bearer* of the *testimony* from the celestial to the terrestrial world.[1] We have already[2] analysed the import of the μαρτυρία under the caption of 'the believer's testimony', and found that the μαρτυρία in its technical sense, in other words, the Divine, or spiritual, μαρτυρία, is actually the Divine Life itself in relation to the world, and that it falls naturally under the general ideas of κατάβασις and ἀνάβασις. To repeat: *the Divine μαϱτυϱία* is based upon, or rather *is itself the Divine-spiritual reality, brought down* to earthly men (κατάβασις) and also, *the self-expression of that reality in man* (ascending ever upwards in his experience of Jesus (ἀνάβασις), cf. above pp. 120, 121).

---

[1] J. Lindblom, *Das ewige Leben,* p. 223: »Es ist nämlich zu bemerken, dass die johanneischen Schriften die Person und das Werk Jesu vorzugsweise von einem Gesichtspunkt aus betrachten, der hier stärker als anderwärts betont wird, nämlich von dem Gesichtspunkt eines Ablegens eines Zeugnisses. Jesus als der in der Welt erschienene und handelnde Gottessohn legt durch seine Person und sein Werk ein Zeugnis ab, um von den Menschen durch Glauben empfangen zu werden. Jesus hat den Menschen eine μαρτυρία zu bringen. Diese μαρτυρία bringt er den Menschen durch sein Erscheinen überhaupt, durch seine Person, durch seine Worte, durch seine Taten. Jesus spricht zu Nikodemus: ὃ οἴδαμεν, λαλοῦμεν καί ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε (3^{11}). Der Täufer bekennt, dass Jesus eine μαρτυρία vom Himmel zur Welt gebracht hat und konstatiert den tragischen Erfolg: niemand nimmt seine μαρτυρία an ($3^{31\text{ ff.}}$). Vor Pilatus bekennt Jesus selbst: 'Ich bin dazu geboren und dazu in die Welt gekommen, um für die Wahrheit Zeugnis abzulegen' 18^{37}.

Die Erscheinung Jesu in der Welt bedeutet also nicht nur, dass etwas in der Geschichte gescheben ist, und geschehen musste, damit Gott den Menschen die Gabe des Lebens schenken könnte. Die Erscheinung Jesu in der Welt können wir sagen, hat für die Menschen eine noch unmittelbarere, immer gegenwärtige Bedeutung, sie hat in eigentlichem Sinne *Offenbarungscharakter*, indem sie Zeugnis ablegt von einer göttlichen Wahrheit.... *Durch seine Sendung in die Welt* und ... durch *sein persönliches Sein* ... legt Jesus von der göttlichen Liebe Zeugnis ab.»

[2] above pp. 120, 121.

Since the κατάβασις and ἀνάβασις are wholly contained in the Son, the μαρτυρία in all its connotations may also be said to be contained in the Son. The Son *gives* μαρτυρία (to the world), he *receives* μαρτυρία (from the Father on one side, and from the believer, *i.e.* from any one who has experienced his Divine Life, on the other), he *possesses* the μαρτυρία (in the sense of the constant presence in him of Divine Life: the whole fullness of Divinity corporeally).

The Johannine conception of the Divine μαρτυρία may be said to be only another instance of the peculiar idea of the all-inclusiveness of the Divine-spiritual reality concentrated and revealed in the Son (cf. above p. 113) or, from another point of view, of the *identity* of spiritual realities (cf. above p. 168). Hence, one might formulate the conception thus: the spiritual μαρτυρία is not — as is the case with the external, terrestrial, μαρτυρία — a μαρτυρία merely *concerning* a certain body of facts or certain details of reality, but — to repeat again — *it is* the spiritual reality, with the qualification: as it expresses itself. He who, in any degree, possesses, *i.e.* has transformed himself into, ascended to, the all-pervading spiritual reality, he *eo ipso* possesses the Divine μαρτυρία. Further, in the light of the rule of the essentiality of the Son of Man, it is evident, that no spiritual μαρτυρία exists apart from the Son of Man. Just as J can say: »I am the Truth», or »I am the Life» or »I am the Water of Life», he could say: »I am the μαρτυρία». Lastly, however, since the essentiality of the Son is based, not upon an independent authority of His, but upon His unity with the Father, the inclusivity of Divine Reality and μαρτυρία in J implies that *the real source of the μαρτυρία is the Father,* or, otherwise expressed, that *the μαρτυρία* **is**: *the Father as present in the Son.*

An examination of all passages in Jn containing any form of the words μαρτυρία or μαρτυρεῖν will bear out the adequacy of the above analysis; such an examination will, however, also reveal another important aspect viz. the frequent *antithesis* between the Divine-spiritual μαρτυρία and another kind of μαρτυρία, viz. μαρτυρία in its usual, normal, earthly, and, consequently, to »Jewish» minds comprehensible sense (μαρτυρία in its common sense may be termed »external μαρτυρία»). This antithesis again is the natural application of the general rule of the antithesis between the Divine-spiritual reality and the non-spiritual, *e.g.* terrestrial world. The antithesis, further, is used to show the complete other-ness of the spiritual μαρτυρία from the external μαρτυρία; the former defies all logic of the latter.

$5^{31 \text{ ff.}}$ take as apparent starting-point the external μαρτυρία, the rule of which is: a man's testimony for himself is not valid *per se,* and the apparent sequel is: J does not depend merely on his self-testimony. But the dictum really goes deeper, and in fact starts with a rule concerning the spiritual μαρτυρία to the following effect: **self**-*testimony is not only not valid, but it is eo ipso* **not true.** There is a clear allusion to, and linking up with, the starting-point of section 5^{19-29}, viz. 5^{19}: οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν, ἂν μή τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα· ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ, *i.e.* J again states his complete dependence on »another», viz. his »Father». Just as the activity of J is wholly derived from that of his Father, so also the very existence of J's μαρτυρία is conditioned by his absolute unity with and dependence on his Father. Thus *self-testimony,* in the sense in which it is spoken of in 5^{31}, means not merely testimony concerning oneself but an act of severance from the centre and fountain-head of the spiritual world, the establishment of oneself as an independent or self-dependent being; such an act of self-assertion in the spiritual realm at once relegates the subject of that act to the class of beings »who are of the lie», »who hate the light» or, to use another technical expression of Jn for this category, »*who seek their own glory*» (8^{50}), or who »come in their own name» (5^{43} ctr. 5^{30}). (Cf. the implied sense of the expression ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ, 5^{18}, treated of above pp. 203 f.) To express the *antithesis* between the spiritual and terrestrial the teaching might be worded thus: in the terrestrial world it may be possible to give testimony of oneself as an independent or self-dependent being, but in the Divine-spiritual world this is impossible, since, in the Divine world, there exists no separateness.

5^{32}: ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ; still speaking in the terms of 'external' μαρτυρία J conveys that the μαρτυρία originates from his Father, and this μαρτυρία he *knows to be true, i.e.* the Divine μαρτυρία carries the truth in itself, it is identical with the spiritual truth, which in turn, as the μαρτυρία, is identical with the spiritual reality itself. An external μαρτυρία, a μαρτυρία *concerning* something, may be either true or false. The Divine μαρτυρία which is not a μαρτυρία *concerning,* but the thing itself, cannot be false, it either exists, or does not exist, *i.e.* a man either possesses this μαρτυρία or does not possess it. 5^{32} also implies that, properly speaking, there is only *one* spiritual μαρτυρία, namely that of the 'Father'.

This is followed up by 5^{33-35} ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λέγω, ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε. ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠθελήσατε ἀγαλλιαθῆναι πρὸς ὥραν ἐν τῷ φωτί αὐτοῦ. John the Baptist did possess the Divine μαρτυρία within himself, and hence »he bare witness to the truth». Since whatever experiences of the Divine may be given a man can only be given in and by the Son of Man, the Baptist's testimony must of necessity have been a testimony of the Divine reality as mediated by the Son of Man: »the Baptist's testimony refers to the Divine-spiritual οὐσία of J» ($1^{8,9,15,32,34}$ cf. above p. 121 ll. 6 ff.). »But I receive not testimony from man» — with these words J points out that he does not refer to the Baptist for an external testimony from him on his own behalf. »These things I say *that ye might be saved.*» This is a highly-important dictum. It contains a further revelation concerning the nature of the Divine μαρτυρία, *viz.* in that it answers the question: »*How can the Divine μαρτυρία be brought home to exclusively external beings,* to beings who do not possess the Divine μαρτυρία?» or »How can it be translated into the terms of external μαρτυρία, be valid as an external μαρτυρία?» (In reality a special case of the general question: how can the spiritual be revealed to the wholly non-spiritual?) The answer is: *it cannot.* Or, to follow the argument here implied in the mind of the Judæans: »How can J demonstrate to men who possess nothing of the Divine μαρτυρία, that He is of Divine origin and acts and speaks with Divine authority?» Answer: *he cannot possibly demonstrate it to such men.* Positively formulated: there is one single point of possible connexion between the Divine μαρτυρία and the hearers addressed, viz. the fact, that they »*sent unto John*» and that they »were willing» — although only »for a season» — »to rejoice in his light», *i.e.* the mere fact that the hearers for a short time were accessible to the testimony of John the Baptist shows that, for that time at least, they were not merely external, but possessed within themselves an element of the spiritual; for that time they had, even if only in a very faint degree, the Divine μαρτυρία which made them responsive to the Divine μαρτυρία that spoke in John the Baptist. If that element of spiritual life could only be reactivated, they would be open to the Divine μαρτυρία of J, and thereby to the salvation brought by him — *they would be saved.* Thus, to sum up, J does not appeal to the external testimony of John the Baptist in order to demonstrate this Divine authority, but He tries to awaken in the hearers the memory of that spiritual experience of theirs, which for them was associated with their time of »rejoicing in the Baptist's light»; through this reminiscence the experience itself would perhaps be revived and thereby not only the responsiveness to the Baptist's μαρτυρία but also to the present μαρτυρία of J. There follows as a corollary the following consideration — which is in keeping with express pronouncements in the sequel of the present section and with a cardinal thesis in the Johannine system of thought — namely: there was also, beside the spiritual μαρτυρία of the Baptist, an external testimony by him concerning J. This external testimony is the record, or perhaps, the personal memory in the minds of the hearers, of the actual words in which the Baptist »bare witness unto the truth». We may infer that this testimony, *quā* external, *i.e.* without the element of spiritual life in the hearer, cannot be accepted by them. This was also the implied fact: the hearers did not believe in J in spite of the Baptist's testimony.

5^{36} ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω[1] τοῦ Ἰωάννου in connection with 5^{35a} ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων brings out the singular position of J: his essentiality. He *possesses the Divine testimony in a higher degree than John, i.e.* really, he possesses the Divine μαρτυρία in its entirety, to its fullest extent, — whereas *John the Baptist,* like everyone else who has received the Divine μαρτυρία — the Divine Life — *has received it through the Son of Man.* The Baptist like all other bearers of the Divine μαρτυρία be it Abraham (8^{56}) or Moses (5^{46}) or Isaiah (12^{41}), was really dependent on, or rather, actually implied in, included in, the Son of Man.

5^{36b} τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτά, αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ, μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν. This links up with 5$^{17-19}$. Hence the meaning of the present reference to the 'works' of J is grasped, when one recalls the significance of the Son's works or activity according to 5$^{19-29}$. The 'works', then, in their profound sense, are not mere external performances by J to which he appeals, by way of external testimony, in order to make it probable or evident that he was sent by his Father. The works are that activity of J, in absolute dependence upon, but also with complete authority from, his Father, (cf. above p. 191), which implies that He is doing the *Father's* work of making the voice to be heard, of conferring life and executing judgement. Thus the *'works'*, ἔργα, are a spiritual μαρτυρία, testimony to Jesus, *in so far as* and *only for those on which he has done the Father's works of conferring life;* to those who have »heard his voice», accepted his word [λόγος] (cf. 5^{24}) and believe in Him who has sent him, his works have become a μαρτυρία, and, naturally, since the Son's activity is the Father's activity, the μαρτυρία is a testimony that his Father has sent Him. This sense will perhaps appear still more self-evident, if one puts by the side of the present dictum the wellknown utterance of Jn 7^{17}: ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς πότερον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν ἢ ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ λαλῶ. Only one who has been the responsive object of J's activity, who has 'done the truth' etc., in other words, who has had the Divine reality revealed to himself, can accept or has accepted the μαρτυρία of these works.[1]

---

[1] μείζω which is generally accepted instead of the variant μείζων will, on consideration, be seen to suit the interpretation of μαρτυρία here vindicated better than μείζων.

In vs. 37 ff. the emphasis is not on the beginning sentence: καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ, ἐκεῖνος μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ, for this in itself follows without saying from the immediately preceding, and is moreover, a repetition of vs. 32, but on the sequel: οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε, καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε *ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα*, ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε. The Father's testimony concerning the Son, to those who know only of an external μαρτυρία, is indeed a sheer impossibility. For they have never heard his voice nor even seen him; the question whether the φωνὴ αὐτοῦ here contains any allusion to the Jewish conception of the בת קול (*Băþ Qŏl*, daughter, *i.e.* echo, of the Divine Voice) must, I think, be regarded as highly improbable. It is generally known that the *Băþ Qōl,* so far from implying a presumption on the possibility of hearing the voice of the Holy one, instead actually was an expression of the opposite.[1] On the other hand, vss. 37 and 38 clearly allude to 5^{24} (*ὁ τὸν λόγον* μου *ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πεμψαντί* με) and 5^{25} (*ἀκούσωσι τῆς φωνῆς* τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ)[2] — indeed the whole of the present section, 5^{30-47}, alludes to the preceding section

---

[1] One might perhaps even press the sense to the tautology: only he who has entered the spiritual reality, has entered the spiritual reality; some sort of intentional tautology may indeed be said to be involved in the Jn-ine statements concerning the spiritual reality, since the absence of the quality of separateness makes it evident that logically every statement concerning the spiritual reality can be brought down to an identification of that reality with itself, or to the formula: *all is all.*

---

[1] *Tos. Sōṭā* 13_2

משמת חגי זכריה ומלאכי נביאים האחרונים פסקה רוח הקודש מישראל ואף
על פי כן היו משמיעין להן בבת קול

i.e. since the death of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, the last of the prophets, the Holy Spirit withdrew from Israel but nevertheless they (*i.e.* God) communicated with them by *Baþ Qōl.*» The Baþ Qōl is a substitute for the closer communication that could be between God and his people in the former days. We have, of course, in Mt 3^{17} Mc 1^{11} 9^{7} *Jn* 12^{28} Acts 11^{7} Rev. 10^{4} instances of the *Baþ Qōl* as giving testimony (on J), worded so as to convey that it is God that is speaking: »And lo a *voice from heaven,* saying this is *my* beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased». A clear and exhaustive analysis of the conception of *Baþ Qōl* and of the different uses of the term is given by Billerbeck I 125—135. Nobody that is in the least acquainted with the Rabbinic idea of the *Baþ Qōl* would of course detect therein the faintest approach to the meaning of φωνή in Jn 5^{25}; the *Baþ Qōl* gives separate, definite pronouncements on definite questions and on definite occasions. (Cf. Abelson, *Immanence,* p. 258—267.) For an interesting instance of the *Baþ Qōl* (voice from heaven), not generally known, reference may be made to the *Testament of Abraham*, ed. G. H. Box, p. 25 (ch. xiv). Also here God is the subject, the »I» of the pronouncement of the *Baþ Qōl.* The »*Voice of God became a Meṭaṭron*» is a mystical utterance, preserved, though not understood, in *GenR* 5_2. Cf. also *NumR* 14_{35} speaking of Yhuh's voice in the Tabernacle.

[2] Notice the characteristically Johannine manner of the allusion, which serves to underline (1) the essential sameness of sense of the passages concerned, (2) the interrelative identity, if such a term may be used, of the spiritual realities conveyed through the terms of the passages. The method of interchange of correlative terms or permutation of identical conceptions has been called attention to above, pp. 169 f. It will be apparent from the following paradigm:

5^{24-26}	5^{37-39}
τόν λόγον μου ἀκούων	τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς μένοντα
πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με	ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε
ἀκούσωσι τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ	οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε ...

To the permutation of terms there are here added two other characteristic features: (1) what in one passage is said of the *Father,* in the other is said of the *Son,* and vice versa, meaning: the Father and the Son are one; he who has seen the Son, has seen the Father, (2) 5^{24-26} speaks positively, of the believers, of those who are open to the Spiritual reality, 5^{37-39} speaks negatively, of those who are closed to that reality — object: to bring out the sharp contrast between the two classes.

5^{19-29}. The meaning is: the only possibility of hearing the *Father*'s voice or seeing his shape is hearing the *Son*'s voice and seeing him, in the spiritual sense of the words.

Vss. 39, 40, 45—47 the μαρτυρία of the Scriptures, specifically of Moses: ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ **μαρτυροῦσαι** περὶ ἐμοῦ. **καὶ οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε** . . . μὴ δοκεῖτε ὅτι ἐγὼ κατηγορήσω ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα: ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε. εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν. εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασιν πιστεύσετε. This dictum is closely connected with the discourse with the Samaritan woman concerning the 'well of the Tora' and the 'true worship'. The sense of the present reprimand to the Jews has also been brought out already in connexion with the analysis of that discourse (*vide* above p. 189). It is a sweeping condemnation of the hearers' study *(midraš)* of the Scriptures *(kiƀbe ha-qqōđæš)*. They are not, as they themselves maintain or believe, faithful to and devoted to the Scriptures; they do not even believe in the Scriptures, *because they are closed to the reality to which the Scriptures belong*, *of which the Scriptures speak. The hearers have placed themselves in a sphere of existence altogether severed from that from which the Scriptures have proceeded.* They are therefore, simply *unable* really to *believe* in the Scriptures. The hearers belong to the sphere of σκότος (darkness), ψεῦδος (lie), of hatred of the light, spoken of and put in contrast to J's world in Jn 3^{16-21}. The Scriptures again, as belonging to the spiritual world, of necessity possess the Divine μαρτυρία, and of like necessity, this μαρτυρία is the μαρτυρία of J: ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἵ μαρτυροῦσαι περί ἐμοῦ (Aramaic: *'illēn hāu̯in sāhᵃđin ʿᵃlai̯*).[1]

---

[1] It is to be noticed that J does not deny the validity of the statement that the Scriptures confer eternal life. The sense of vss. 39 f. in this respect is *not:* »you think you have eternal life in the Scriptures, and because you think so (*i.e.* maintain that the Scriptures contain all you need to obtain eternal life) you do not come to me for eternal life», but instead: »you consider yourselves to have the means of attainment of eternal life in the Scriptures and *rightly so*, for they testify of me as the bringer of eternal life; and *yet* you do not come to me that you might have life». J denies that the hearers really believe in the Life of the Scriptures *(kiƀbē ha-qqōđæš)*. Thereby he relegates the hearers' relation to the Scriptures to a mere external one: they study, expound, ponder over the external, the written or traditionally recorded wordings of the testimony of the Holy Writ, but they are altogether deaf and blind to the Divine μαρτυρία of the Tora. (Ctr. Bernard, *ICC, Gospel of St. John,* pp. 252 f.)

With this understanding of the real sense of the passage concerning the Scriptures and Moses[1] it is immediately clear, why vss. 41—44 are put in the midst of that passage. They contain the natural corollary to the statement concerning the hearers' self-severance from the world of the Scriptures, or which is the same, the world of Truth, of Life, of Light, of the Father's Love. The self-severance from that world is a 'declaration of independence' against God: τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε (44); they do not care for the honour [that comes] from God (parallel with the expression: 'they do not do the will of God'). The expected corollary is really, in analogy with the expression 'do their own will': they seek *their own* glory. That is said also, but a further, fine detail is added: »they receive honour *from each other*». This covertly expresses a specific doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, viz. that of the coherence of the world of Darkness. The citizens, so to speak, of the world of separation and self-dependence, have a feeling of *kinship* with each other, yea, there exists a real kinship: they are *children of the same Father,* viz. the διάβολος (8^{44}), they detect in each others' manner, acts, volitions, familiar traits; they *love* the common family-feature, viz. the Darkness (3^{19}), they *hate* that which reveals itself as not being of the Darkness but belonging to another world ($15^{18, 19}$), whereas they *'cannot hate'* those which are of the same kin, belong to the same world (οὐ δύναται ὁ κόσμος μισεῖν ὑμᾶς 7^{7}). Hence it is in keeping with their very nature, when they reject J, *because he comes in his Father's name* ($5^{43\,a}$), whereas it is also a necessary consequence that they accept one *who comes in his own name* (*i.e.* who is self-dependent, who has severed himself from God, ($5^{43\,b}$). J, on the other hand, does not receive honour from men (vs. 41), *i.e.* from the men of the world of separation, that of his hearers[2], but, instead, he knows them (καρδιογνώστης as he is, cf. on 2^{25}) and knows that they do not belong to the Spiritual World, that not even a single ray of the *Father's Love* (acc. to 3^{16}) has penetrated into their world from the Spiritual World. ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, amounts to saying: »when the Light (sent by the Father's Love) came to the world, you loved the Darkness better than the Light and did not come to the Light (*i.e.* receive within you the Father's Love)». Thus the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ should be taken as a possessive genitive, not as an objective.

---

[1] Cf. on 3^{14}, 6^{32}, $7^{19, 27}$ and $9^{28, 39}$; the hearers' relation to Moses is identical with their relation to Abraham: their descendance from Abraham and their discipleship in relation to Moses are merely external: spiritually they have denied both.

[2] παρὰ ἀνθρώπων does not refer to any authors of the O.T., or to John the Baptist, but evidently to 'men' in the same sense as in 3^{19} (those who love the darkness 'more than' the 'light').

Is there in the words of vs. 43 b ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκεῖνον λήψεσθε any reference to a definite individual? The guess that the ἄλλος is the tragical *Bar Kōzīḇā,* proclaimed as Messiah A.D. 132—135, is well-known. Earlier exegesis identified this 'other one' with Antichrist. The analysis of the real meaning of the present passage given above seems however to open the way to a solution that is in perfect accord with the subject of the whole section and also with the Johannine system of thought as a whole. On the basis of the doctrine of the kinship of the citizens of the world of separateness and their filiation to a common Father, there is only one single, definite, individual that can be referred to by the word ἄλλος; and that is *the father of the children of falsehood* himself, the διάβολος of ch. 8 44. But the διάβολος is indeed acc. to Jn-ine conception κατ' ἐξοχὴν one »who comes in his own name», *i.e.* who separates himself from God, and indeed it is true of his adherents, his »children», that they »will receive him»: (8 44) **τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν.**

The conception of the Divine μαρτυρία in its antithesis to the external μαρτυρία as analysed above is indeed specifically Johannine. No parallel can be found in other sources. But the question remains, whether the language, the general terminology, used by Jn to convey the specific conception in view, can be shown to exhibit close affinity to that of any known source.

In *Mandæan* literature there are quite numerous instances of the use of the terms 'witness', 'testimony', 'testify'. To the literary phenomenon of Jn 5 1—47, consisting in that Jn seemingly makes J appeal to a series of witnesses: the Baptist, God, the Scriptures, Moses, further to the conception of the Father and the son as testifyers of the spiritual life in the believer, there may be said to be certain parallels in the Mandæan literature. The instances, in order to show both the type of expressions and language used and also the *difference* of inner meaning from Jn, must needs be reproduced at some length. Naturally the references to 'witness' and 'testimony' frequently occur in connection with statements concerning the Divine judgement on the spirits, immediately after death or at the Last Day. Then it is the spirits that need witnesses. But there are also instances of the Messenger's appealing to witnesses.

MLi Qolasta I xxi 33 7—34 8

מן יארדנא סילקית בכאנא דנישמאתא פיגית בכאנא פיגית
דנישמאתא דבאבון שיתיל מיתכארכא אמרילה בהאיאך אבון
שיתיל אסגיא מינאיאן ליארדנא עז מאסגינא מינאיכין ליארדנא
מאן ניהויא עלאואיכין סאהדא יארדנא ותרין כיפה עלאואיאן
ניהויא בסאהדיא פיהתא וכושטא ומאמבוגא עלאואיאן ניהויא
בסאהדיא האבשאבא וכאנא דזידקא . . . מאשכנא דסאגדינאבה
ע"נ"ב זידקא דבכאפאיאן ע"נ"ב אבון דברישאיאן ע"נ"ב האזין
הז דבאיינא האזין נישמאת צאביא . . . סאהדיא הינון דכישטא
ושארירא כול דאמרין

(The newly baptized speaks:) »From Jordan I ascended; then I met the tribe of the spirits, the tribe of the spirits did I meet, who surrounded Siþil, our Father. They said to him: 'By thy life, O Siþil, our Father, (we beseech thee), go with us to the Jordan'. 'If I go with you to Jordan, who will be your *witness?*' '*Jordan* and its two banks will be for us as witnesses, *Pitha, Kušṭa* and *Mambuga* will be our witnesses, *Sunday* and the *almsgiving*, the *tabernacle* in which we worship, the *zidqā* in our hands (*i.e.* the alms given by us) will be our witnesses, our *Father at our head, will be our witness*.' . . . This it is that I desire, this it is that I pray for (when I ascend to the House of Life, and go to the shining abode; when the Life questions me, then witnesses will come and testify). Truthful witnesses they are, and true is all that they say.» (Cf. *GL* 85.)

GL III 3 512 7 f. (*Pet* 79 8)

האבשאבא וכושטא וזידקא לנישמא הולה סאהד(י)א

»Sunday, Kušṭa and alms, be ye witnesses for the spirit (ascending after earthly life to its spiritual home).»

Another instance of the Mandæan use of the term 'witness' may be illustrated by the following passage.

GR XIII 285 35—286 12 (*Pet* 288 18—289 9)

האלין סאהדיא לאגטינין עלאואיהון האייא רורביא קאדמאייא
דסאהדיא לאגטינין עלאואיהון יושאמין דאכיא דשריא על עצריא
דמיא ועל מאמבוגיא רורביא עלאייא דאכייא דנהורא בסאהדיא
לאגטינין עלאואיהין אבאתור האתיקא ראמא כאסיא ונטירא דראם
ויאתיב אמיק זכסיא האזיא ופאריש באלמיא ודאריא האזיא מאהד

דאבדיא ומשאלאט על נישמאתא למיתקאל בכ׳ל עיבאדיא דאבדיא
בסאהדיא לאגטיא (לאגטינין) עלא־איהון היביל ושיתיל ואנוש
בסאהדיא לאגטיא עלאואיהון שאמיש וזיוה וסירא ותוקנה בסאהדיא
לאגטיא עלאואיהון האבשאבא וכאנא דזידקא בסאהדיא לאגטיא
עלאואיהון קאלא דהייא ומימרא ופאקאדתא ומזאהרותא דאתאתאלה
מן בית אבאתור ומן בית הייא רביא קאדמאייא בסאהדיא לאגטיא
עלא־איהון תארמידיא . . . בסאהדיא לגיטיא עלאואיהון:

»[Against the false and unfaithful Mandæans] we call the following witnesses: '*The Mighty, First Life* we call as *witness* against them. Yošamin, the pure one, who dwells up on the treasures of water and upon the mighty, celestial, pure springs of light, we call as witness against them. 'Abaþur, the ancient, high, secret and guarded one, who is high and seated in the deep, and sees what is hidden and searches the worlds and generations, sees what they are doing and is appointed over the spirits to weigh all the works that they have done — him they call as witness against them. Hibil, Siþil and 'Anoš they call as witnesses against them. The sun and its splendour, the moon and its brilliance they call as witnesses against them. Sunday and the almsgiving they call as witnesses against them. The *Voice of the Life,* the *Word,* the commission and the warning that came from the house of 'Abaþur and from the house of the Great, First Life — they call as witnesses against them. The priests . . . are called as witnesses against them.»

GR XV 5 317^{28-31} (*Pet* $315^{7\text{f.}}$)

נאציראייא דשיהיא שיהיא אנאת הויבין סאהדא אנאת סאהדא
הויבון ובהאילאך דילאך ניסקון לאתאר נהור

»For the Nasoræans who are ardent and persevering be thou (*scil.* Sām-Ziu̯a, the Messenger) a *witness;* a witness be thou for them, and *through thy power they shall ascend* to the abode of Light.»

In connection with baptism as the birth of spiritual life of the believer the messengers »give testimony *(sahđuþa)* to the spirits».

GR XIII 282^{10-13} (*Pet* 285^{4-6})

שילמאי ונידבאי דמשאלטיא על יארדנא דהאייא ועל מאצבותא
ראבתיא דנהורא וסאהדותא ושומא ורושמא יאהביא לנישמאתא

»Šilmai and Niđbai who are appointed over the Jordan of Life and over the Great Baptism of Life and who give *testimony* and name and sign to the spirits.» The 'testimony', put on a par with 'name' and mystical 'sign' *('rušma'*[1]*)*, here is a possession of the believer, concomitant with the possession of spiritual life. This is the nearest approach to the Johannine conception of the *inner, Divine* μαρτυρία.

GR XVI 11 397 9—11, 20—24

קאלא דמאנדא דהאייא דקאייב בבירייות אלמיא בבירייות אלמיא
קאייב לבהירה מקארילן לבהירה ואלגיט עלאואיהין
סאהדיא ואמאר האייא בסאהדיא הוליא על קאריא דמן תיביל קרית

»The voice of *Mandā dHayyē,* standing at the outskirt of the worlds; he stands at the outskirt of the worlds and calls for his elect ones; he calls for his elect ones and summons witnesses against them; he speaks: *'O Life, be a witness for me* against the called ones which I called from Tiƀil!'» (Cf. Jn 17 6 et sin.) This is a sort of parallel to the Son's appeal to the Father's testimony in Jn.

In *Jewish Mystical* litterature one might point to the following: *3 En* 4 5 48 C 2, Meṭaṭron, the *'little Yhu̯h'*, is God's witness against those who separated themselves from Him and said: to him: »*Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways*» (Job 21 14). Here Meṭaṭron actually is brought in unison with God and in contrast to the world of separation and self-dependence (cf. above).

A fragment in the same work, belonging to a somewhat later stratum, viz. *3 En* 48 D 6, 7 contains the following passage:

אמר מטטרון . . . ה׳ אלהי ישראל הוא עד לי בדבר זה שכשגליתי
רז זה למשה . . .

»Meṭaṭron (the little Yhu̯h, the 'Son') said: . . . »*Yhu̯h, the God of Israel, is my witness* that when I revealed this secret to *Moses* . . . (the sequel is of no moment.)» It may be noticed that Meṭaṭron appeals to God as his witness, and that this testimony is connected with the giving to Moses of the inner meaning of the Scripture.

---

[1] Cf. the identical cabbalistic term *'rušma'*.

Šiʿur Qōmā[1] has the strange opening:

אמר מטטרון שרא רבא דסהדותא מעיד אני עדוה זו ביהוה אלהי ישראל

»Meṭaṭron, the Great Prince of Testimony, said: I witness this witness (= I give this testimony, μαρτυρία) concerning Yhuh, the God of Israel etc.» Meṭaṭron, thus, is the bearer of the μαρτυρία and this is a μαρτυρία concerning the inmost secret of the Godhead.

With regard to *Rabbinical* instances of the use of the terms of 'witness' and 'testimony' the following may be considered relevant.

(1) To 5^{31} the *hᵃlāḵa: M Roš ha-š Šānā* 3 1, *M Kᵉþubbōþ* 2 9: »A man's testimony is not valid for himself», (*vide* Billerbeck II 466, 522), which is taken as starting-point; one may also consider *M Makkōþ* I 6, containing the rule that a witness is to be judged as intentionally false only if his false testimony can be brought down to a false *self*-testimony אין העדים נעשים זוממין עד שיזימו את עצמן.

(2) To J's appeal to his Father's testimony. The corresponding formula in Rabbinic: »The Holy one bears witness to . . .» refer to a Divine utterance recorded in the Scriptures, as was observed by Schlatter[3]. For God as 'witness' *viche* also *ʾĀƀōþ* 4 22 and *cf. TYKᵉþ* 26 c *Midr. ʾŌṣar Ṭōƀ* 15 a. *Mel. ʿOl* 27.

---

[1] In *Sifrā dᵉʾāđām qaðmāʾā*, ed. Warsaw 1913 fol. 30 col. c. *Vide* Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, *Introd.* p. 103.

[2] The Johannine travestation in 5^{31} and 8^{13} is not Rabbinic: the Rabbinic *hᵃlāḵā* or this point was indeed extremely logical. It has, however, been mentioned above (p. 219) that the travestation must be considered intentional: the object was, here as elsewhere, to show the absolute other-ness of the spiritual reality, by putting it in startling contrast to the conditions of this world. Acc. to the rules of the terrestrial world a self-testimony is not valid, but it may be either true or false; in the spiritual reality a self-testimony is always false, in so far as it implies a declaration of self-dependence, of separation. — The literary formula 'bear witness of one-self' would seem to be attested in early Rabbinic literature through the instance given by Schlatter, *S. u. H. 4 Ev.* p. 70 from *Mᵉḵ, Bᵉšallaḥ, 20 a*, which runs: *'hū mēʿid ʿal ʿaṣmō šæhu man šæʾēnō i̯ōrēđ lō baššabbāþ u̯ᵉlō lᵉi̯ōm tōƀ uᵉlō lᵉi̯ōm hakkippurīm'*, »it, *i.e.* the mannah, bare witness to itself that it was mannah, because it did not come down either on Sabbaths, on festivals or on the Day of atonement, (*i.e.* it conformed to the Divine rules of the Tora, and thereby showed itself to be really mannah, *i.e.* a gift of Divine origin). *Mᵉḵiltā dᵉR. Šimʿon b. Yoḥai,* unknown to Schlatter, has *'maggiđ'* (proclaimed, made it known, revealed) in order to allude to the letters of the word *'gađ', i.e.* coriander, with which the mannah was compared (*Ex* 16^{31}).

[3] *S. u. H. 4 Ev.* p. 70 *Exod. R.* 1 20:
קשטו עצמן למעשה זקנן זה אברהם כמו שהקב"ה מעיד עליו כי עתה ידעתי כי ירא אלהים *i.e.* God *gives witness to* Abraham with the words (*Gen* 22^{12} »now I know that thou fearest God».

(3) To the appeal to the testimony of the works performed Billerbeck[1] adduces *GenR.* 16 6.

If that passage be taken as a whole, it will be found to contain very near parallels of phraseology with Jn 5^{36}.

ר׳ יהושע דסכנין בשם ר׳ לוי אמר אומרים לפרת למה אין קולך הולך א״ל איני צריך מעשי מודיעים אותי . . . אומרים לחדקל למה קולך הולך א״ל הלואי נשמע קולי ונראה. אומרים לאילני מאכל למה אין קולכם הולך א״ל אין אנו צריכים פירותינו מעידין עלינו אומרים לאילני סרק למה קולכם הולך א״ל הלואי נשמע קולינו ונראה.

R. Yᵉhōšūªʿ from Sik̄nin says in the name of R. Lēu̯i (Palestinian ʾĀmōrā, c:a 300 A.D.): »They ask the river Euphrates: 'why is not thy voice heard?' (why are thy waters so quiet?). The river answers: 'I need not (make my will heard) for *my works* make me known' . . . They ask the river Tigris: 'why is thy voice heard? (why do thy waters make such noise?)' It answers: 'that my voice may be heard and that I may be seen. They say to the fruit-trees: 'why is not your voice heard?' They answer: 'we have no need thereof, for our fruits *bear witness of us*'. They ask the wild trees: 'why is your voice heard?» They answer: 'that we may be heard and seen'».

The object of the Rabbinic dictum is to teach a *morale;* there is not the slightest parallel of thought with Jn 5^{36}. The absence of parallelism of thought evidently applies also to the Rabbinic instances of the use of the terms 'self-testimony' and 'Divine testimony'.[2] The *phraseological, linguistic,* correspondence again is extremely close, one might even venture to say exact.

This correspondence of phraseology and expression between Jn and Rabbinic may perhaps best be illustrated by the following diagram, where the sentences of the present section have been put side by side with the corresponding Rabbinic phrases.

---

[1] II p. 467.

[2] Jn may be said to make external allusion to Rabbinic ideas; *e. g.* there might be said to be an allusion to the Rabbinic connection of Divine testimony and the testimony of the Holy Scripture: 5^{37} compared with 5^{39}.

Jn	Rabbinic	
	Hebrew	Aramaic
31 Ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ	אם אני מעיד על עצמי	אין אנא מסהיד על גרמי
ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής	עדותי אין אמת(ית)	סהדותי (לית) שריראית
32 ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ	יש אחר (ש)מעיד עלי	אוחרא אית מסהיד עליי
οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ	ידעתי שאמת העדות שמעיד עלי	ידענא די קשט סהדותא די מסהיד עליי
33 μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ	מעיד על האמת	מסהיד על קושטא
34 ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω	אני לא מבני אדם נשאתי עדות	אנא לא מבני נשא סהדותא נסיבנא
ταῦτα λέγω ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε	זו אמרתי כדי שאתם תחיו	הדא אמרנא בגון דאתון תחיון
35 ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων	הלז היה הנר הדולק והמאיר	ההוא הוא בוצינא דלקא ומנהרא
ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠθελήσατε ἀγαλλιαθῆναι πρὸς ὥραν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ	ואתם רוצין לשיש לשעה באור(ו) שלו	ואתון בעין מיחדי לשעה בנהורא דילו
36 ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου	אני יש לי העדות יותר מן יוחנן	אנא אית לי סהדותא יתיר מן יוחנן (TY Gen 48_{19})
τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτά, αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ πσιῶ, μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν	מעשים שנתן לי האב שאגמור אותן, אותן המעשים שגומר אני, מעידין עלי שהאב אותי זימן [or: שלח]	עובדי דיהב לי אבא דאשלים (דאשיצי) יתהון, אילין עובדיא דעבדנא, מסהדין עליי דאבא שדרני [זמנני]

Jn	Rabbinic	
	Hebrew	Aramaic
37 καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ ἐκεῖνος μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ	ושולחי אב הלז מעיד עלי	ושלחי אב[א] ההוא מסהיד עלי
οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε	לא קולו מעולם שמעתם ולא ראיתם דמותו	לא קליה מן יומין שמעתון ולא הזויה חזיתון
38 καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε	ודברו לא תמצאו [ימצא בכם שרוי שמי שזימנהו הלה בו אתם לא מאמינים	ופתגמיה לא נטרתון בכון שרי דמאן דשדריה ההוא [אבא] ביה אתון לא מאמנין
39 ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν	דורשים אתם את כתבי הקדש שאתם סבורין למצא בהן חיי עולם	דרשיתון כתביא דאתון סבירין בהון חיי עלמא למשכח
καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ	והללו המעידין עלי	ואילין אינון דמסהדי עלי [מסהדיא עלי]
40 οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε	לא רוצין אתם לבוא אצלי כדי שתמצאו [cf. 5^{34} חיים [or : שתחיו	לא צביתון למיתי לי דחיין יהון לכון
41 δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρώπων οὐ λαμβάνω	כבוד מבני אדם לא קבלתי [איני נוטל] אלא ידעתי אתכם	יקרא מבני [א]נשא לא נסיבנא (מקבלנא) ברם [אלא] הוית ידע יתכון דרחמותא דאלהא לית לכון [בגויכון]
42 ἀλλὰ ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς	שאהבת אלהים (מקום) לא יש בכם (לא השריתם בתוככם)	
43 ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατ-	אני באתי בשם אבי ולא תקבלוני אם בא אחר	אנא אתי הוית בשום אבא ולא מקבליתון יתי אין

Jn	Rabbinic	
	Hebrew	Aramaic
ρός μου καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετέ με — ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκεῖνον λήμψεσθε	בשמו שלו אותו אתם מקבלים	אתא אוחרא בשום דיליה ההוא [יתיה] מקבליתון
44 πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι, δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε	היאך יכולים אתם להאמין [ש]כבוד זה מזה מקבלים ואת הכבוד שמן האלהים (ה)יחודי לא מבקשים	היך יכליתון למהימנא דיקרא דין מדין מקכליתון ויקרא מן אלהא יחידא ליתיכון בעין [לא בעיתון]
45 μὴ δοκεῖτε ὅτι ἐγὼ κατηγορήσω ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε.	אל תהיו סבורין [אל תסברו] שאני אקטריג [אסטין] אתכם [עליכם] לפני האב. יש קטיגור שלכם משה שבו אתם מקוים [בוטחין[1]]	לא תהוון סבירין דאנא אסטין [אקטריג] עליכון קדם אבא. אית קטיגורא דילכם משה דביה [אתון] סבריתון [מסתכין, בטחין]
46 εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν	אלו האמנתם[1] במשה האמנתם בי. [ש]עלי הוא היה כותב	אלו האמנתון במשה האמנתון בי דעליי ההוא הוא כתיב
47 εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασιν πιστεύσετε	אם בכתבים שלו לא האמנתם, היאך במאמרות שלי תאמינו	אין בכתביא דילו לא האמנתון, היך במימריי [פתגמיי] דילי תאמנון [מאמיניתון]

---

[1] For the Rabbinic idea of »belief in» and »trust in» *Moses*, *vide* the fundamental passage *Mekiltā* 1^{3} d 14 a, cited in full above pp. 138, 139.

6^{26-71}. The difficulty of the present discourse may be said to centre in the problem of the relation between the conception of the '*Celestial Food*' (the 'bread from heaven', the 'bread of Life') and the conception of the '*Flesh and Blood of the Son of Man*' and since the two conceptions, or complexes of conceptions, dominate each their own sections of the discourse, the said problem is at the same time a question of the literary relation between those sections.

The different solutions of the problem may be classed as follows:

A. Partition theory. The discourse is regarded as composed of two or more strata. Spitta[1] treats (1) as *original* ('Grundschrift'): the utterances speaking of Jesus as the giver of the true heavenly bread, (2) as '*the redactor's reflexions*': the portions identifying Jesus with the bread from heaven, and (3) as *additions,* adduced from a non-Johannine source: the portions speaking of the flesh and blood. Thompson[2] maintains that »the sacramental section» (*i.e.* $6^{51\,b-56}$) owes its present form and position to an editor of the Gospel. similarly Merx, assigns the portions alluding to the ideas of the »eucharistic sacrament» to redactors, and considers the idea of a »spiritual bread coming down from heaven», »the mystical conception of the spiritual food», as »the old, genuine conception» of the section. Generally it may be said, that, the premise of a composite character of the section once accepted, the original meaning, *i.e.* that which best fits in with the gospel as a whole, is found in the complex of conceptions here defined as that of the Celestial Food or Bread from Heaven and not in the 'sacramental' ideas, *i.e.* the conceptions connected with the terms 'Flesh' and 'Blood'.[3] Cf. further the discussion of the partition theories in part ii of the present work.

B. On the assumption that the discourse is a literary unity, the solutions offered *usually* take the form of an interpretation of the whole discourse in the light of one of the parts. Thus, *either* the so-called sacramental section is maintained not to be sacramental at all, since the bread from heaven, is = the teaching of J, *or,* since the sacramental section, as it is then urged, cannot possibly but allude to the eucharist, the whole of the discourse (and also, by the way, the preceding narrative) must refer primarily to the eucharist. It is needless to go into the history of the exegesis in these respects (it would merely be a repetition of what every standard commentary on the Gospel records).

---

[1] *J. Ev.* p. xxii, 145—156.

[2] *The Interpretation of John vi* (*The Expositor,* Ser. 8, vol. 11, 1916, pp. 337—348).

[3] *Das Evangelium des Johannes* etc. pp. 122—140.

It suffices to state that what may be called the 'leading opinion' of modern exegetical scholarship sees in the present section a clear allusion to the sacrament and, moreover, maintains that the main intention or object of the section is to give a doctrine of the eucharist. The fourfold τρώγειν (vss 54—58) necessitates the idea of a real 'eating'. Further, the whole eucharistic terminology is found collected in the chapter, as εὐχαριστεῖν $6^{11, 23}$, διδόναι ἄρτον φαγεῖν, πίνειν, ὑπέρ 6^{51} (Mc 14^{24} Lc $22^{19, 20}$ 1 Co 11^{24}), αἷμα, σάρξ. The idea of the celestial food which nourishes eternal life can be traced in the Greek world as far back as to Homer, and is also at home in the East. The underlying idea of the eucharist, *i.e.* of the eating of the flesh and blood of Christ, is that by consuming the Deity, embodied in some edible object, man enters into communion with the Deity and the thereby sharers in (eternal) Life».[1] Nevertheless even the leading opinion — although otherwise maintaining the essential unity of the Gospel — is seriously inclined to doubt that the section 51 b—58, which is the 'sacramental' portion κατ' ἐξοχήν, forms an original part of the discourse. Thus Loisy surmises that $5^{26, 27, 32, 33, 47, 48}$ and $5^{51, 53—58}$ — which he terms 'the poem on the Bread of Life' — is independent of the dialogue,[2] and J. Estlin Carpenter virtually urges that $5^{51—58}$ should be regarded as an explanatory addition.[3] Modern Roman Catholic scholars, whose works bear the official »Imprimatur», naturally connect the section with the eucharist. M.-J. Lagrange, in his admirable commentary[4], defines $6^{51—59}$ as a »revelation (*scil.* by Jesus) of the eucharist» and 6^{25-50} as »a necessary prelude» to this revelation, as a preparation of the spirits of the hearers for a spiritual understanding of »the manducation, indeed very real, of the body» of Christ. Similarly F. Tillmann,[1] regards the eucharist as the central idea of the section, treated of directly 6^{48-58} and subjointly 6^{25-47}.

---

[1] Bauer, *Joh. Ev.*² 95, 96, Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile* pp. 236, 244—246, J. B. Naish, *The Fourth Gospel and the Sacraments* (*The Expositor,* 8 Ser., 23 pp. 53—68), J. Estlin Carpenter, *Johannine Writings,* pp. 429 ff., Notice, however, the strange turn in Carpenter's interpretation on pp. 435 f. (cf. p. 428, l. 20).

[2] *Le Quatrième Évangile* p. 233.

[3] *Johannine Writings* p. 428 and *ib.* note 2. »I cannot avoid the conviction that in 51—58 language on a very different plane compared with that in 32—50 has been here embodied. The verbal indications are, it is true, but slight; they point, however, to other modes of religious utterance, and these (it may be argued) are in the sequel practically disowned.»

[4] *Évangile selon Saint Jean* pp. 171, 183.

From the more conservative Anglican side Nolloth may be quoted. He naturally takes a more spiritual and positive religious attitude to the Fourth Gospel. But also to Dr Nolloth the chief importance of Jn 6 seems to lie in the fact that this chapter gives the »authoritative teaching of our Lord» upon the meaning of the Sacrament of the Eucharist.[2]

An independent and highly ingenious interpretation of the section is given by Kreyenbühl (whose theories are usually passed in silence by the commentators). From his starting-point, viz. that the Gospel is the self-vindication of a mystic, Gnostic, Christian (Menander) against the doctrines of the organized Church (Ignatius), he evolves a solution which, on the said premises, is vastly more consistent than that of the leading opinion which finds in ch. 6 an advocating of the consumption of the flesh and blood of Christ on the line of earlier and contemporary ideas of the consumption of Deity as this opinion sees and judges them. Kreyenbühl maintains that the section really speaks of the Eucharist, but not by way of advocating it but by way of a strong rejection of this sacrament, as being a *ritus*, an institution of the Church. The object of the Evangelist is, acc. to Kreyenbühl, to put against the Sacrament of the Church (which in the text is intended by the 'mannah', the 'Jews' of text being really the Ignatian-Church) his own spiritual understanding: the real flesh and blood of the Son of Man (= the Evangelist) are his teaching, his religion, his life in God and of God, and these only are potent of eternal Life.[3]

---

[1] *Das Johannesevangelium* p. 115 »V. 48 stellt, indem er auf V. 33 zurückblickt, den Gedanken heraus, der beide Teile der Rede zur Einheit verklammert: Jesus ist das Lebensbrot sowohl als der in dem Glauben gewonnene wie auch als der in der Eucharistie empfangene Christus.»

[2] *The Fourth Evangelist* pp. 142 f.: »The true significance of the Eucharist only became manifest when the discourse in the Synagogue at Capernaum was published. The Sacrament is shown to be rooted in the fundamental relations of God and man and to be the application of the principle of the Incarnation to the spiritual needs of the individual.»

[3] *Evangelium der Wahrheit,* ii, pp. 12—102. Notice especially the following passage (p. 38 f.) »Wir verstehen den Tadel Jesu v. 26: Die *kirchlichen*

Independent of the leading exegetical opinion is also Fr. Büchsel who in his important study of the Gospel declares it to be a false method to interpret the whole discourse as referring to the Eucharist.[1] The Eucharist is spoken of only in Jn 6^{51-58}. In a discourse on the Eucharist, 6^{36-40} and 6^{44-47} would be superfluous. The discourse is primarily concerned with the right to and duty of Belief in Christ.[2] He shows that the interpretation given by the leading exegetical opinion (represented by Bauer) makes the discourse simply unintelligible.

The principle of the present investigation is to try to find the real meaning of the discourse by viewing it in its connexion with the Johannine system of thought (or mystical representations) as a whole and to understand the expressions used, on the background of the phraseology, terminology and ideas of the religious thought of cognate or in any way related circles.

The conception of the '*Bread from Heaven*' is to be understood as parallel to that of the '*Water*', *i.e.* it falls under the category of the conceptions of the Divine, spiritual efflux. This is so self-evident that it hardly needs demonstration. It is immediately apparent that the present section, with regard to the conception of the 'Celestial Bread' moves in exactly the same sphere as chh. 3 and 4 with regard to the conceptions of the

---

Christen suchen in Jesus *nicht den Geist,* der die »*Zeichen*» *des Evangeliums wirkt, Neuschaffung des Geistes, Wiedergeburt, Leben, ewiges Leben,* sondern sie wollen vom Brote des kirchlichen Abendmahls essen und satt werden. Was der Jesus des vierten Evangeliums wirkt, sind die σημεία $2^{11, 18}$ 3^{8} 4^{54}, die von den »Juden» nicht beachtet werden (v. 26); was *die grosskirchlichen Gegner* wirken, warum sie sich *ausschliesslich bemühen,* das ist *die vergängliche Speise des Abendmahls,* welcher der Gnostiker die *Speise, die das ewige Leben bleibt, gegenüberstellt.* Er ist der »Mensch», den Gott zu diesem Zwecke beglaubigt und gesandt hat. Damit ist *das ganze Thema der grossen Rede ausgesprochen.*»

[1] *Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus* 1928 p. 49—52.

[2] Following observations by Büchsel will be seen to be very much to the point: »... Beziehungen zu jener barbarischen Kultfrömmigkeit, in der man die Gottheit ass, liegen also nicht vor. Das ist durch V. 63 und schon durch die gesamte Gottesvorstellung des Evangeliums ausgeschlossen. Selbst wenn sich Johannes hier an Formeln aus einem Kultus anlehnen sollte, in dem man die Gottheit ass, so hätte er diesen überkommenen Vorstellungen durch die Verbindung mit V. 63 einen ganz anderen Sinn gegeben, den paradoxer Einseitigkeiten, die von der entgegengesetzten Einseitigkeit her verstanden werden sollen. Wer Johannes 6 nimmt, wie es uns nun einmal überliefert ist, im Zusammenhang des Johannesevangeliums und des johanneischen Denkens, kann hier keine Anschauung vom Abendmahl finden, die auf einer Ebene mit den heidnischen Vorstellungen von den Mysterienmahlzeiten u. dgl. läge» *op. cit.* p. 51.

'Birth from above', the Spiritual σπέρμα and the 'Water of Life': the antithesis between the celestial-spiritual reality and the terrestial, the descent of the Divine into the realm of earthly men, the comprising of every Divine efflux or gift in the Son of Man (= »I am the bread that descends from heaven»). The parallel with the Divine Birth and the Celestial Water goes even further, viz. to the *realistic* emphasis. Just as ch 3 wants to impress that the birth from above is a real birth into the celestial world, in every sense as real as the birth into earthly existence, so the bread from heaven is no mere symbol, or simile, say for 'doctrine' or 'teaching', but the Spiritual Bread is quite as real a food (βρῶσις), *nota bene:* within the Spiritual world, — as earthly bread, or earthly food. The transition to the conception of the consumption of the flesh and blood of the Son of Man is quite natural. Since the Son of Man **is** the Celestial Bread, He himself must really be »eaten» — *nota bene:* in the world of the spririt —, *i.e.* He must enter into and be assimilated with the *spiritual organism* of the believer; it is quite in keeping with the strong realistic emphasis of the discourse on the birth from above, if this eating of the spiritual bread is put realistically as eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man, *i.e.* in order to impress strongly that the acquisition of the heavenly bread, the 'imperishable food', was no mere allegory. But with this understanding of the meaning of the discourse it is obvious, that no part of the discourse, — still less the whole of it — can *primarily* refer to the sacrament of the Eucharist. In fact, one who understands the words of the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood to refer to the bread and wine of the Eucharist takes exactly the mistaken view of which Nicodemus in ch 3 and the 'Jews' here are made the exponents, viz. that J's realistic expressions refer to objects of the terrestrial world instead of to objects of the celestial world.

It is also apparent that the »*Manna* of *Moses*» is the exact parallel of the »*Water* of the well of *Jacob*» of 4^{7-15} and of the »*worship* on the *mount of Garizim* or *at Jerusalem*» *i.e.* it belongs to the category of such objects of religious devotion or such religious ideas through and in which men imagined themselves to be in communion with the Divine world (with the spiritual reality) to have Life, but which, acc. to Jn, *did not* communicate the spiritual reality, Life.

The expressions 'Bread from Heaven', the 'Imperishable

Food' correspond to current ideas and expressions. Briefly it may be said that the 'heavenly bread' and the 'celestial food' are to be identified with the terms *parnāsā* (פרנסה) and *māzōn* (מזון), which actually expressed the idea of a spiritual food coming down from the spiritual world. It is significant that, in Jewish, especially Rabbinic, circles, the conception of the *parnāsā* was frequently connected with that of *manna*, which latter in many cases plays the exact rôle of the *pārnāsa*. It is also to be remembered that *parnāsā* and *manna*, as designating or symbolising the divine 'gifts', the spiritual efflux, are in the mystical language further connected with the terms '*water*', '*rain*' etc. The parallelism between 'celestial bread' and 'spiritual water' is thus not confined to Jn.

GenR 20$_{22}$

ר׳ אלעזר אמר הקיש גאולה לפרנסה ופרנסה לגאולה שנא׳ ויפרקנו מצרינו
וסמיך ליה נותן לחם לכל בשר מה גאולה פלאים אף פרנסה פלאים מה
פרנסה בכל יום אף גאולה בכל יום רשב״נ אמר וגדולה מן הגאולה
שהגאולה ע״י מלאך והפרנסה על ידי הקב״ה. גאולה ע״י מלאך מניין
שנא׳ המלאך הגואל אותי מכל רע פרנסה ע״י הקב״ה שנא׳ פותח את ידך
ומשביע לכל חי רצון ריב״ל אמר גדולה מקריעת י״ס שנא׳ לגוזר ים סוף
לגזרים ואומר נותן לחם לכל בשר כי לעולם חסדו וגו׳.

»*R. '*^{Æ}*lʿāzār* said: the salvation compares with the *pārnāsā* and the *parnāsā* with the salvation (*i.e.* they are on a par, and mutually related, one can kno of one from the other) as it is written (Ps 136$^{24, 25}$): »And hath redeemed (= salvation, '*g*^{e}*'ullā*') us from our enemies: for his mercy endureth for ever; who giveth food (= *parnāsā*) to all flesh: for his mercy endureth for ever.» Just as the *salvation* is connected with miracles, so the *parnāsā* is connected with miracles, just as the *parnāsā* is (given) daily so the *salvation* is (worked) daily. R. Š^{e}mu'el bar Naḥmān said: yea (the *parnāsā* is even) greater than the *salvation*, for the salvation is worked *through an angel*, but the *parnāsā* is given *by the Holy One Himself*; whence do we know that the salvation is worked through an angel? (answer:) it is written (Gen 48^{16}): 'the angel which saves me from all evil'; whence do we know that the *parnāsā* comes through the Holy One Himself? (answer:) for it is written (Ps 145^{16}) 'Thou openest thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing!' R. Y^{e}hōšu$^{a'}$ ben Lēu̯i said: the *parnāsā* is greater than the (miracle of) the division of the Red Sea (basing upon Ps 136^{13} and 136^{25}).

TB Taʿᵃnīþ 2 ab

אמר רבי יוחנן ג׳ מפתחות בידו של הקב״ה שלא נמסרו ביד שליח ואלו הן של חיה ושל גשמים ושל תחיית המתים של חיה דכתיב וישמע אליה אלהים ויפתח את רחמה של גשמים דכתיב יפתח ה׳ לך את אוצרו הטוב וגו׳. ושל תחיית המתים דכתיב וידעתם כי אני בפתחי את קברותיכם. במערבא אמרי אף מפתח של פרנסה דכתיב פותח את ידך ומשביע לכל חי רצון ור׳ יוחנן מאי טעמא לא קאמר לה להאי אמר לך ר׳ יוחנן גשמים נמי היינו פרנסה

»R. Yoḥᵃnan said: Three keys are in the hands of the Holy One, which he does not commit to any messenger (= angel). And these they are: (the key) of *birth* (or of the womb), of the *rains*, and of the *vivification of the dead;* of birth, as it is written (Gen 30^{22}), 'and God hearkened to her, and opened her womb', of the rains, as it is written (Deut. 28^{12}) 'The Lord shall open unto thee his good treasure, the heaven to give the rain unto thy land in his season', of the vivification of the dead, as it is written (Ezek. 37^{13}) 'And ye shall know that I am the Lord when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves.' In *Palestine* they say: also the (key) of the *parnāsā*, as it is written (Ps 145^{16}) 'Thou openest thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing.' And why does not R. Yoḥᵃnan say this (*i.e.* include the *parnāsā*)? Because R. Yoḥᵃnān says: *rains* also are *parnāsā*» (*i.e.* 'rain' and 'food', as spiritual effluxes, are really identical).

In *TB Šabb* 120 a the words of *Isa* 3^{1} 'the whole stay of bread' are explained as referring to the Torā: in *GenR* 70_{5} (to Gen 28^{20}) it is said that the proselyte may find in *Israel 'the bread of the Torā'* (acc. to Prov. 9^{5}). In *CantR* 1_{4} it is said: 'As *water* refreshes the body so does *the Torā refresh the soul:*

Mᵉk. 9 d (to Exod. 13^{18})

ויסב אלהים את העם כדי לעשות נסים וגבורות במן ובשליו ובבאר

»'And God led the people about, (through the way of the wilderness of the Red sea)' in order to do miracles (= σημεῖα) and migthy deeds (= δυνάμεις[1]) through the *manna*, the quails and the *well*.

---

[1] As is well-known δύναμις does not occur in Jn.

GenR 54 1:

אמר שלמה אם רעב שונאך האכילהו לחם ואם צמא השקהו מים. מלחמה של תורה המד״א לכו לחמו בלחמי ומימיו של תורה המד״א הוי כל צמא לכו למים.

»(R. ʾAḥā said): Salomon said (Prov. 25 21): 'If thine enemy be hungry, give him *bread* to eat, and if he be thirsty, give him *water* to drink'. Understand: the *bread* of the *Torā*, in accordance with the word (Prov. 9 5; Wisdom = Tora, says:) Come, eat of my bread, and the *water* of the *Torā,* in accordance with the word (Īsa 55 1) Ho, every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters.»

The idea of the Mannā of the Messianic age is well-known and the passages referring to it frequently cited.

Ap. Bar 29 8 »And it shall come to pass at that self-same time (*scil.* when the Messiah shall begin to be revealed) that the *treasury of manna* shall again *descend from on high* and they shall eat of it in those years, because these are they who have come to the consummation of time».[1]

Interesting in connection with Jn 6 is the parallelism between Moses, as the »first Saviour» and Messiah as the 'Last Saviour'.

Eccl.R 1 28 (cited by Billerbeck ii, p. 481)

ר׳ ברכיה אמר בש״ר יצחק כגואל ראשון כך גואל אחרון מה גואל ראשון נאמר ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בניו וירכיבם על החמור כך גואל אחרון שנאמר עני ורוכב על החמור מה גואל הראשון הוריד את המן שנא׳ הנני ממטיר לכם לחם מן השמים אף גואל אחרון יוריד את המן שנא׳ יהי פסת בר בארץ מה גואל ראשון העלה את הבאר אף גואל אחרון יעלה את המים שנאמר ומעין מבית ה׳ יצא והשקה את נחל השטים

R. Bᵉrækȳā said in the name of R. Isḥāq (Palestinian ʾĀmōrā, third generation, about 280 A. D.[2]): As the *First Saviour* (*Gōʾēl, i.e.* Moses) so is the *Last Saviour*. Just as it is said with reference to the First Saviour: (Exod. 4 20) 'and Moses took his wife and his sons and set them upon an ass', so also it is said of the Last Saviour (Zech 9 9) 'lowly and riding upon an ass'; just as *the First Saviour caused the manna to descend,* as it is written (*Exod* 16 4) 'behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you', so also *the*

---

[1] *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, transl. Charles (T. E. B.), p. 53.

[2] The real time of the ideas in question is of course much earlier than that of the tradens. This is demonstrated in the present case by the passage in *Ap. Bar.*

Last Saviour will cause the manna to descend, as it is written (Ps 72^{16}) 'There shall be bread of wheat upon the earth'. Just as the First Saviour brought up the *well,* so the Last Saviour will bring up the *water,* as it is written (Joel 3^{18}) 'And it shall come to pass in that day that ... a *fountain* shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim'. Significant is here: (1) that it is expressly stated that *Moses* brought down the manna: the view with which Jn 5^{32} joins issue[1], (2) the juxtaposition of the *well, fountain, water* and the *manna,* which coincides with the Johannine parallelism with the well and the water of life of ch. 4 on one hand and the manna and the celestial bread of ch. 6 on the other.

Mᵉk̄. 9 c

אמר הב״ה אם אני מביא עכשיו את ישראל לארץ מיד מחזיקים אדם
בשדהו ואדם בכרמו והן בטלין מן התורה אלא אקיפם במדבר ארבעי׳
שנה שיהיו אוכלין מן ושותין מי הבאר׳ והתור׳ נכללת בגופן

The Holy One, blessed be He, said: »If I now suffer Israel to enter the (promised) land, then they will at once seize (= be absorbed in the cultivation of) each his field and each his vineyard and be idle in (or interrupt) the study of the Torā. Instead I will 'lead them about' in the desert for forty years that they may eat *manna* and drink the *water* of the well and (thereby) the *Torā* will be *united (assimilated) with their body.*

The Manna, like the *parnāsā,* is a spiritual food for the members of the spiritual world:

Mᵉk̄iltā dᵉR Šimʿon ben Yoḥai 78, and *Mᵉk̄.* 19 d

ר׳ אלעזר חסמא אומר בעולם הזה אין אתם מוצאין אותו אתם מוצאין
אותו לעולם הבא

R. ᾿Ælʿāzār Ḥᵃmāsā said: »in the terrestrial world (this world) ye shall not find it» (*scil.* the Manna); »ye shall find it in the world to come» (in the spiritual world, *n.b.* not necessarily = the future world).

Acc. to *TB Ḥag* 12 b in the heaven Šᵉḥāqim is produced the

---

[1] *RuþR* 5_6, *NumR* 11_3, *CantR* 2_{22} record the dictum:

לסוף מ״ה ימים נגלה להם ומוריד להם את המן

»at the end of 45 days He (the Holy One or Messias) [is revealed to them] and brings down to them the manna».

Manna for the righteous (tradens: *R. Mēʾīr*[1] ab. 150); similarly acc. to *Tanḥuma,* ed. Buber § 21 (33 b), the manna is prepared for the righteous in עולם הבא, *i.e.* for the spirits *(nᵉšāmōþ)*, the members of the spiritual world. Cf. Rev. 2^{17}: τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου.

Manna as the Celestial food, namely as the angel's food (an old idea), is also attested as a dictum of R. ʿ^{A}qībā (died about 135), recorded

TB Yōmā 75 b, in a Bāraiþā

תנו רבנן לחם אבירים אכל איש לחם שמלאכי השרת אוכלין אותו דברי רבי עקיבא וכשנאמרו הדברים לפני רבי ישמעאל אמר להם צאו ואמרו לרבי עקיבא טעית וכי מלאכי השרת אוכלים לחם והלא כבר נאמר לחם לא אכלתי אלא מה אני מקיים לחם אבירים אל תקרי לחם אבירים אלא לחם איברים לחם שנבלע ברמ״ח איברים

»There is a Bāraiþā: '(Ps 78^{25}) Man did eat angel's food'; that means the food that the ministering angels eat. That is R. ʿ^{A}qiba's words. When these words were told R. Išmaʿel, he said: Go and say to R. ʿ^{A}qiba: you are mistaken: do the ministering angels eat bread? Is it not written (Deut 9 9) 'I neither did eat bread nor drink water'. But how do I explain the words *'læḥæm ʾabbirim'?* answer: 'do not read: *'læḥæm ʾabbirim'* but *læḥæm ʾēbārim, i.e.* bread that is (wholly) consumed by the 248 bones of the body, *i.e.* has no excrementa», cf. *Acts of Thomas,* Syr. version cited below p. 246. The opposition, or controversy, between RR. ʿ^{A}qibā and Išmaʿel on this point is only a literary form. Both those scholars were versed in the mystical thought, and the quoted dicta both belong to the tradition of Jewish mysticism.

According to early Jewish mysticism (1 and 2 centuries A. D.) the spiritual qualities are viewed as celestial substances. Important in the present connection is (1) that among those substances is the *parnāsā,* here clearly taken in the sense of spiritual food, but at the same time on a par with 'Life', 'Love', 'Tora'. (2) that those qualities or substances are committed by the Holy One to Meṭaṭron, the little Yhuh, the Jewish mystical counterpart to the 'Son'. (3) that they are thought of as distributed by Meṭaṭron to the world.

3 En 8 1 enumerates the following spiritual substances committed to Meṭaṭron:

---

[1] *vide* Billerbeck iii 532.

»*Ḥoḳmā́* (Wisdom), *Bīnā́* (Understanding), *Ḥayyim* (Life), *Ḥēn u̯ā-Ḥásæđ* (Grace and Loving-Kindness), *ʾAh*^{a}*bā́* (Love), *Š*^{e}*ḳīnā́* (Divine Presence), *Tōrā́*, ʿ^{A}*nāu̯ā* (Meekness), *Parnāsā́*, *Raḥ*^{a}*mīm* (Mercy), *Šālōm* (Peace), *Yirʾáþ Šāmáim* or *Yirʾaþ Ḥēṭ*, Fear of Heaven or Fear of Sin.

One notices the parallels with the Jn-ine: ζωή, χάρις ($1^{14, 16, 17}$), ἀγάπη (5^{42} etc.), ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμίν (1^{14}), διδαχή ($7^{16, 17}$), βρῶσισ (4^{32}, $6^{27, 55}$), εἰρήνη (14^{27}, 16^{33}), also γινώσκειν (cf. above on 2^{15}).

It may be observed that this idea (and term) of the spiritual *parnāsā* obtains throughout the different stages of development of the Jewish mysticism. Meṭaṭron gives *parnāsā* to the celestial world. This *parnāsā* is expressed by the words *māṭār* (rain, to denote the 'descent' (Jn κατάβασις) of the celestial food, and *man* (manna). The continuity of tradition is recognizable in the following passage:

Y.R. i 60 a

ידוע אצל בעלי קבלה סוד המן כי הוא לחם אבירים והוא מזון רוחני למלאכים מגיע אליהם מצד כח האצילות ומיד העשירות מתייחסים בשם מטטרון ע״כ רמז הכתוב הנני ממטיר לכם לחם מן השמים שכל הרוחנית נזונים ממנו. וכל אותן מ׳ שנה שהלכו ישראל במדבר היה אותו המן מתגשם מכח לכח ומתמורה לתמורה עד שנתגשם בכח הרצון המתחדש פליאות. וכשירד והגיע לארץ נשתנה צורתו ונעשה לחם ההוא הטהור הנבלע באברים. ומטטרון שר הפנים ששמו כשם רבו הוא ממתיקו ומתבלו והוא מחליפו מצורה לצורה גשמית הוא סוד המן וסוד המטר

»It is known to the masters of mystical tradition *(qabbālā)* that the mystical meaning of the manna is contained in the sentence: 'it is the food of *ʾabbīrīm* (angels); it is the spiritual *(ruḥanī)* food *(māzōn)* for the angels which comes to them from the sphere of 'emanation' (or efflux: ʾ^{a}*ṣilū́þ*) and from the side of 'fullness' *(ʿ*^{a}*širūþ)*, which are derived from the name of Meṭaṭron (*i.e.* descend from Meṭaṭron); to this alludes the passage of the scripture (*Exod.* 16^{4}): 'Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you', for all the spiritual world receives its maintenance from him. And all those forty years that Israel walked in the desert, that manna was caused to descend (flow out, emanate) from sphere to sphere, and from *t*^{e}*murā́* to *t*^{e}*murā́* (*t*^{e}*murā* = lit. change; manifested, phenomenal existence, roughly: from one spiritual world down to another) until it flows down into the sphere of the Rāṣōn (the »Will»), which is the sphere of miraculous transformations (*lit.*

that is renewed by miracles). And when it descended and reached the earth, its quality was changed and it was transformed into that pure bread, that was consumed by the bones (*'ēḇārim,* R. Išmaʿel, above p. 244) and Meṭaṭron, the Prince of the Divine Presence, whose name is the same as the name of his Lord *(i.e. Yhuh),* he sweetened it and spiced it and he changed its substance for the purpose of its descent. That is the mystery (the mystical meaning) of the manna and the mystery of the rain.»

Acts of Thomas I, 6, 7, Syriac version (in the song of the »daughter of light», ('sung in the Hebrew tongue'): ... and (the groomsmen, bridesmaids and attendants of the bride, the daughter of light) shall attend at that banquet whereof the eternal ones are accounted worthy, and shall put on royal raiment, and be clad in bright robes; and in joy and exultation shall they both be, and shall glorify the Father of all, whose *proud light (nuhrā gazi̯ā)* they have received, and are enlightened by the splendour *(ziu̯)* of their lord, whose *immortal food (purnaseh)* they have received that hath no failing and have drunk of *the (water of) life* that giveth *them neither thirst nor desire*[1] (cf. Jn 4^{14}, 5^{35}). Notice here (1) the use of the technical term *purnās(ā)*, (2) that the whole refers to realities of the spiritual, Divine realm, (3) that *light, splendour, food* and *water*[2] (also: *raiment*) are parallel terms

Zohar ii 156 b

פתורא דבר נש מזכי ליה למיכל על פתורא אחרא בעדונא דההוא עלמא
כד״א כי על שלחן המלך תמיד הוא אוכל ודוד מלכא הוה אמר תערך
לפני שלחן נגד צררי ודא איהו אתסדרותא דפתורא בההוא עלמא דהא
כדין איהו עדונא וכסופא דנשמתא, אתהני בהי בעלמא דאתי וכי פתורא
אית לון לנשמתין בההוא עלמא אין דהא מזונא סְפִיקָא דעדונא אכלי
בההוא עלמא כגוונא דמלאכי עלאי אכלי וכי מלאכי עלאי אכלי אין
כגאוונא דלהון אכלו ישראל במדברא וההוא מזונא רזא איהו לטלא דנגיד
ואתמשך מעילא מרזא דעלמא דאתי, ואיהו מזונא דנהירו משה רבות קדשא
ונשמתהון דצדיקיא אתזנו מתמן בגנתא דעדן ואתהנון תמן דהא תמן
נשמתהון דצדיקיא מתלבשן בגנתא דעדן דלתתא כגוונא דהאי עלמא

»Man's table makes him worthy to eat at the another table *(pāpūrā),* in the pleasure of that world (*i.e.* the spiritual world) as it is written (2 Sam. 9[13]): 'for he did eat continually at the king's table', and King David says (Ps 23[5]) 'thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies'. That is the preparation of the table in that world, for in accordance with the *enjoyment* (pleasure) and aspiration (longing) of the spirit will its enjoyment be in the celestial (*lit.* future) world. And is there, then, a table for the spirits in that world? Yes! For this food *(mᵉzōnā)* and bounty *(sippuqā)* of pleasure they eat in that world similarly as the celestial angels eat. Do then the celestial angels eat? Yes, they do. Of the same kind (of food) did *Israel eat in the wilderness.* And that food is the secret of the *dew* that *descends* and is attracted from above from the secret of the future world, and it is the *food* of *light* spreading over the holy Glory (*rᵉƀuꝑ qudšā, i.e.* the realm of the Divine Glory). And the *spirits of the righteous* (the spirits about to be born into earthly life) are nourished from that place (*scil.* from the 'secret of the spiritual world, the fountain of the dew and food of light') in the garden of Eden for there the spirits of the righteous clothe themselves, in the garden of Eden below, after the appearance of this world (*i.e.* in earthly form).[1]

---

[1] M. R. James, *The Aprocryphal New Testament*, pp. 367, 368, cf. E. Preuschen, *Zwei Gnostische Hymnen*, pp. 15, 17.

[2] The word 'water' does not occur in the Syriac list, but is to be understood (the text has: *u̯eštiu̯ men ḥayyē*).

Cf. *GenR* 40 2

טירוף נתן ליראיו בעוה"ז אבל לע"ל יזכור לעולם

where *ṭirūf* against the later commentators and J. Fürst, should be translated 'nourishment': »He (*scil.* the Holy One gives nourishment to them who fear him in this world, but in the future he will also remember (them with) eternal (nourishment).» Cf. also *GenR* 8 1 *'īm zāꝁā 'āđām 'ōꝁēl šte ʿōlamōꝑ* 'if man is deserving he shall *eat* of the two worlds'.

Also in *Mandæan* literature similar ideas are met with. The Mandæan conceptions might indeed be used to shed light upon the question of the peculiar relation of Jn 6 to the sacramental ideas, in so far as, in the Mandæan religion, there is a kind of sacramental bread, *viz.* the *pihtā*. This *pihtā*,[2] together with a drink of water, called *mambūha (mambuga)*, is given to the baptizand at the occasion of his baptism; there is also a distribution of *pihta* with *mambuha* of water to the congregation, a parallel to the eucharist, and a priestly communion, consisting of *pihta* and *mambuha*, in the latter case purportedly of wine.[3]

---

[1] *Vide* Ernst Müller, *Der Sohar und seine Lehre*², 1923, p. 78.

[2] Probably = the Aramaic פתתא, *pittᵉpā* 'piece of bread', 'bread', *Syr.*, ܦܬܬܐ cf. Brandt, *op. cit.* below note 2.

[3] *Vide* A. J. H. W. Brandt, *Die mandäische Religion*, pp. 107—110.

Now, when the Mandæan sources speak of the 'celestial *pihtā*', one would naturally expect to find in that expression to be merely a projection into the celestial world of the *pihtā* of the cult of the congregation on earth. This might be the case even if, to the minds of the believers, the celestial *pihtā* were the original, the prototype of, or the source of, the earthly *pihtā*. But it turns out that the conception of the celestial *pihtā* goes beyond a mere projection of the sacramental *pihtā*. Just as in the case of the celestial '*water*' it was possible to detect a line of tradition that was independent of, not to be derived from, the baptismal 'water', so it is with the conception of the celestial *pihtā*. The word is the expression, as if by way of translation, of a celestial essence, centred in the innermost spiritual realm, yea, in the central spirit itself, the Mānā. As this *pihtā* is viewed under the aspect of emanation, of outflow, it is associated with the other terms, or qualities, of spiritual efflux as *Light, Water, Fountain, Truth, Life* etc.

GR X 239 27—240 5 (Petermann 238 1—7).

האזין הו ראזא וסידרא דזיוא דיאקיד בגו פיהתא ד̄באר בזיוה̄ דנאפשה̄
ואסגיא בנהורה̄ דהו מאנא קאדמאיא הואבה̄ ופתאבה ודארבה והאימינבה̄
במאנא דהואבה̄ והאימאנבה בזיוא ונהורא דהואבה̄ והאימינבה̄ במאנא
דהואבה דהו שארהאבעיל שמה ונפאק זיוה̄ מן פיהתא ושרא נהורא על
פיהתא ונפאק מינה יקרא לנפשה̄ ניבטא זיוא ונהורא ד̄מין נאפשה̄ יאקיד
זיוה̄ ויאקיד נהורה̄.

»This is the mystery and the book of the Splendour that glows (sparkles) in the *Pihtā*, which shone in its own splendour and was great in its *Light*, for that first *Mānā* existed, created and dwelt in it. It believed in the *Mānā* dwelling in it, it believed in the splendour and light which was in it, it believed in the Mānā, which was in it, the name of which is Šarhabʿel. *Splendour* came forth out of the *Pihtā*, *Light* dwelt on the Pihtā and went out (emanated, radiated) from it. It called itself *Sprout*, Splendour and Light, where Light, where splendour flows out of itself.»

From the parallel beginning of Book IX of *Ginzā Yaminā* it appears that *pihtā* might be exchanged for *mānā* without any greater difficulty. It is evident already from the passage quoted above that *pihtā* belongs to that inmost realm of celestial realities, where there is mutual identity or community of essence, where all is all and all is in all. *pihtā* as representing, like *mayyē* and *mambuhā* the outflow and distribution to, and assimilation by, the inhabitants of the world of the Divine Life, naturally unites in itself the whole sphere of beliefs, religious aspirations, observances and cults of the terrestrial community: the baptism, the *pihtā*, the *mambūhā*, the *zidqā* (almsgiving), the prayer, as well as the *doctrine* of Life.

As further illustrations of this conception may be cited

Ginzā Yaminā (GR) XV, 15.

שאליטתאך בקאלא רבא דהייא דמינה זאכותא נסיבת שאליטתאך בפיהתא
וכושטא ומאמבוגא רישא דכולא שורבתא

»[Hiƀil Ziu̯a is sent by the Life to Yōšāmin, in order to teach him and inspire courage in him. He speaks to him:] I gave thee power through the great *Voice of the Life,* from which thou didst receive victorious power. I gave thee power through *Pihtā, Kušṭā* and *Mambūgā,* O thou head of (thy) whole tribe». Here, then, *Pihtā* together with the Voice of Life, the Kušṭa and Mambūgā are spiritual qualities powers inherent in the Protanthropos, the Messenger, the Son. He is the possessor and bearer of the Divine Pihtā just as he is the possessor and bearer of the Divine Life. Cf. also *Ginzā Smālā (G. L.) III, 13*, 528^{38} (Petermann 91^{8}), where the spirit reascended to the House of Life, and reunited with the Light, says: »my Light prepared the *pihtā* and my mind placed itself before the Life praising it.» *(nhōr pp̄ā pihtā u̯ʿeṣar qāi̯ēm lhai̯i̯ē mšabbalon):* the reascended spirit has the *pihtā* within itself, for it is simply the light, which again is the Divine Life in which the spirit shares.

In *Drāšā dYahyā (M. J.)* 32^{14} (Text 26^{3}), *pihtā* is seemingly used as an equivalent of profane bread. Lidzbarski, *ad loc.* thinks it possible that the underlying meaning is that the celestial beings eat *pihtā* (it occurs in a dialogue between *Yošamin* and *Mandā dHayye*). The members of the celestial world »eat (food) which is not destructible and drink what is not wine».

MLi Qolastā xli is quoted by Bauer[1], as a parallel to the sacramental ideas of Jn 6. The passage runs:

סיגדית ושאבאתה̄ לעוצאר נהור יאואר רבא ד̄הייא פתא פיהתא בכיסיא
ועהאבלון להייא רורביא קאדמאייא בשכינאתון

---

[1] *Joh. Ev.* p. 97.

[2] *GL* I 1, $428^{11\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet.* $8^{14\text{ f.}}$):

אבליא ד̄לאהוא סאיטא ושאתין דלאהוא האמרא

»I worshipped (paid honour to) and praised the treasure of Light, the Great helper of the Life. He prepared *pihtā* in the secret and gave it to the mighly first Life in its Šᵉkinā.» It need scarcely be said that the *pihtā,* even as the 'sacramental food' of the Mandæans, offers no parallel at all to the sacrament of Jn 6 acc. to Bauer's view of the latter. For *pihtā* is in no way connected with the idea of the consumption of the Deity through an edible object. The eating of *pihtā* and drinking of *mambugā* is a cult-act, just as baptism and as *kusṭā* (the hand-clasp, which was the sign of the reception in the community). But there is really quite a close resemblance between the Mandæan conceptions of *pihtā* and the Jn-in conception of the bread from heaven and its relation to the sacrament of the eucharist. The ground for the resemblance again is that the ideas both of Jn 6 and of the Mandæan literature are on a far higher religious level than that with which Bauer seems to associate them and from which he tries to interpret them. With this we have touched the real nucleus to the failure of the leading exegetical opinion (perhaps, after all, it is 'leading' only in its own opinion) to account for Jn 6. It does not face its subject with the attitude of true scholarship, but with the attitude of superiority. Once the purported parallel with the idea of the eating of the deity was detected, the whole gospel falls pitiably to the ground in the eyes of the critic. The idea to the scholars in question is of course absurd and so also Jn becomes absurd. His ideas and conceptions are 'massive' (as Bauer loves to express it). Bauer's attitude towards Jn may be said to be a parallel to the attitude taken by Peterson to the Mandæan literature against which Lidzbarski — to whose authority Bauer rightly defers — sharply remonstrates,[1] viz. that of making a low religious stratum the norm of interpretation of the documents of a very high one, simply on the ground that the two happen to be connected or use resembling expressions or nomenclature.[2]

---

[1] In *Z. Nt. W.* vol. 27, 1928, pp. 321—327 (*Alter und Heimat der mandäischen Religion*).

[2] It is outside the scope of the present work to go into the problems of the significance and development of the ideas of the 'eating of the Deity' from the point of view of history of religion. It may be observed in passing, however, that these problems are as yet not solved at all. It may well be doubted, for instance, whether the NT exegetes have any understanding for the real religious aspirations and experiences that lie behind the various cult-observances in question. This doubt is strengthened when one notices, how e. g. Bauer mixes together the most incongruous religious cults. from primitive to comparatively

It remains now to go into an analysis of the section.

6 26 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ζητεῖτέ με, οὐχ ὅτι εἴδετε **σημεῖα** ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἐφάγετε **ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων** καὶ **ἐχορτάσθητε.** There are two antitheses implicit in this utterance. (1) The antithesis between σημεῖον or ἰδεῖν σημεῖα and ἄρτος or φαγεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ χορτασθῆναι, the 'signs' and the 'bread'. (2) The antithesis between two motives for seeking Jesus, viz. to behold signs made by him or to receive food from him. To these leading antitheses are added in vs 27 two further conceptions: *ἐργάζεσθε* μὴ τὴν *βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην*, ἀλλὰ τὴν *βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν* εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει, *i.e.* (a) the conception of the '*work*', ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι, and (b) the antithesis between the 'perishable food' ἡ βρῶσις ἡ ἀπολλυμένη and the 'imperishable food' ἡ βρῶσις ἡ μένουσα, the food of eternal life, the spiritual food.

Upon these conceptions again are immediately brought to bear two fundamental, wellknown aspects of Jn viz.

(α) the Son of Man as the giver of everything spiritual (ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει)

(β) the complete dependence of the Son upon the Father and the complete conferment of authority by the father upon the Son: the Son's dependence-authority [vs. 28: τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ θεός].

The inception **ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν** naturally *designates that the dictum in question* (6 26 f) contains the clue to *the following discourse.* By the same inception, however, a second dictum of the section is marked out, viz. vss 32 f.: »ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν. ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ. This dictum,

---

developed ones (cf. Bauer *Joh. Ev.* pp. 96 f.). One is even forced to assume that to these exegetes the whole significance of these cult-observances is exhausted by Bauer's statement, *op. cit.*, p. 97: »Die . . . Ueberzeugung, dass äussere Dinge sich mit dem Göttlichen verbinden und, leiblich angeeignet, den Besitz übernatürlicher Güter vermitteln können, hat die Seite des Kultmahles erzeugt, bei dem die Teilnehmer durch Genuss geweihter Speise in magischer Weise göttliche Kräfte zu gewinnen dachten». And with this statement, to Bauer, the whole meaning also of Jn 6 is exhausted! What would these exegetes say, if someone tried to interpret the Upanišads in the manner of the lowest Kali- and Durgacults, *i.e.* reduce the highest teachings of the former to the magical or superstitious ideas of the latter? And yet that is the method of Bauer and Loisy with regard to Jn.

then, may be expected to supplement some other central ideas of the section. As such may be considered

(a) the conception of the '*bread* **from heaven**': the imperishable food of vs 27 is no other than 'the bread from heaven', 'the bread of God'. In this is already implicit

(b) the aspect of *κατάβασις:* the 'bread from heaven' is sent down to, given to, the 'world' (κόσμος), descends (καταβαίνων) from heaven

(c) the antithesis between God and κόσμος, heaven and earth, is parallel with the antithesis between the *imperishable* food and the perishable food; the imperishable food must come from and be given from heaven, it cannot be given from earth (οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν . . .)

(d) the bread from heaven gives *Life* to the world.

Now, what does the section teach concerning the central ideas, the fundamental aspects in question?

(a) the '**work**', ἔργον; to do the work of God is to *believe* in the one who has been sent by God. vs 29: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος. The identification of the doing the works of God (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ) with the belief in God's Messenger (πιστεύειν εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος) should, however, be seen in relation on one hand to the association of the '**work**' with the '***imperishable food***' (vs 27), on the other hand to the identification of the '*belief*' (πιστεύεν) with (1) '*coming to Jesus*' as the Bread of Life (vs 35: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς. *ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ* πεινάσῃ *καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ* διψήσει πώποτε.) (2) with '*beholding the Son*' (vs 40: τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου ἵνα πᾶς *ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν* ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον . .) and (3) with *hearing and learning from the Father* (vs. 45: πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν ἔρχεται πρὸς ἐμέ).

The 'work', then, is on one hand an activity directed towards the obtainment of the *imperishable food,* on the other hand the belief in J = the heairng and learning from the Father (the 'doing the truth' 3^{21}) and coming to *Jesus.* The activity for the imperishable food and the coming towards J is one and the same thing, since Jesus *is* the imperishable food (6^{35}: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς).

The teaching on the belif in J clearly points back to the analogous parts and utterances of ch 3. One meets with the same or similar expressions[1] in both discourses. Hence the utterances should be understood in the light of the discourse of ch 3. The teaching on the work directed towards the imperishable food, again, points to the discourse of ch 4.

It is easily seen, why the *work* is defined as a connection between or identification of belief in J and activity for the imperishable food. Already in ch 3^{5-21} the neccessity of this connection in the Johannine teaching is prefigured. The ground is: the coming to Jesus, the belief in him, is no external belief. The approach to him cannot be made in the external world; it necessitates a 'step from the terrestrial existence into the spiritual existence', which, since the whole of the spiritual world to the believer is contained in Jesus, means a step into the Son of Man himself (— from the external, terrestrial, point of view one would say: a step into the *world* of Jesus; the teaching of Jn is that the world of J is J himself and vice versa —), and entrance into him. But the entrance into J (spoken of in $3^{14\,\mathrm{f.}}$, *vide* above p. 99 and 3^{16-21}, *vide* above pp. 145, 146) is *eo ipso* an eutrance of J into the believer, and this in no mere allegorical sense, but, in a real sense. To emphasise this reality of J's entrance into the believer, the conception of the imperishable food, the bread from heaven presents itself as most suitable.

The *work,* then, which acc. to 6^{26}, is better than the seeing and seeking the 'signs' or 'miracles', is simply the activation of the spiritual element in man, and consequent upon that, the first step from the terrestrial into the spiritual existence. The necessary sequel to the teaching on the 'work', therefore, is the teaching on

(b) the *imperishable food* itself, the **celestial bread.**

The 'work' of the believers evidently falls under the aspect of the ascent (ἀνάβασις) into the spiritual, or the receiving the spiritual reality. As a continuation of the 'work', the ideas of the celestial bread, or the imperishable food, may first be considered

---

[1]

	ch 3		ch 6
3^{21}	ἔργα . . . ἐν θεῷ . . . εἰργασμένα	6^{28}	τά ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ
		6^{29}	τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ
3^{21}	ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν	6^{22}	ἐργάζεσθε . . . τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν
3^{21}	ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς	$6^{33,\,37}$	ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με
		$6^{44,\,65}$	ἐλθεῖν πρός με
		6^{45}	ἔρχεται πρὸς ἐμέ

under the said aspect. The expressions referring to the 'celestial food' under this aspect are the following:

6[27] τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
6[35] οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ . . . οὐ μὴ διψήσει πώποτε
6[40] ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον 6[47] ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον
6[50] ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ
6[51] ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
6[53] ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πίητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
6[54] ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον
6[57] ὁ τρώγων με κἀκεῖνος ζήσει δι' ἐμέ
6[58] ὁ τρώγων τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα and, also, although not mentioning the 'celestial food',
6[62] ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον.

The allusions to the expressions of the preceding discourses are obvious. These allusions are important for determining the significance of the passages involved. Thus, of the expressions just quoted 6[27], »the meat *which endureth unto everlasting life*» corresponds to 4[14]: »the water I shall give him shall be in him a well of *water springing up into everlasting life*». 6[35] »shall never hunger, *shall never thirst*» corresponds to 4[14]: »whosoever drinketh of the water I shall give him *shall never thirst*» 6[40, 47] to 3[15, 16] *e.a.*, 6[50, 51] to 5[24], 6[53] to 5[40], 6[54] to 3[36], 6[57] to 5[26], 6[62] to 1[52] and 3[14].

The exact parallelism between 6[27] and 4[14] is indeed in itself decisive for the interpretation of the former. The 'spring of living water' designates, as was stated above[1], the abiding in man of the spiritual living realities. Similarly the 'imperishable food' *abides* in man unto eternal life. The spiritual realities have entered into him.

Now, in ch. 4, the idea of the indwelling well of water is put in contrast to the idea of the external well, the well of Jacob, which latter could be said to be identical with the knowledge of, the teaching *about*, the celestial world and mysteries of the spirit. If the parallelism is complete, there will be a corresponding contrast in ch. 6. There is, indeed, an apparent correspondence in the contrast to the 'manna' of Moses (6[31, 32, 49]), the manna which the 'fathers' ate (cf. the 'fathers' of 4[20]). Here it should, however, be remembered that the appeal of the Jews to their fathers or to

---

[1] p. 161.

Abraham or Moses — as was pointed out above[1] — is not accepted by J as is the appeal by the Samaritans to their 'fathers'. This fine distinction in the attitude of J is apparently observed even here. The rejected views of the manna, *parnāsā* from heaven, are easily recognized in the Rabbinic ideas, as preserved in Rabbinic literature: (1) When the Jews ask for a 'sign' and convey that they want a miraculous sign like that of the manna, and J retorts, that Moses did *not* give the manna from heaven, this really presupposes the various ideas met with in the Rabbinic litterature. The expression, οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is quite unintelligible as it stands in the text, if it does not contain a conscious allusion to the Rabbinic mode of expression and exegesis. But on the supposition of such an allusion it is pregnant with meaning. It refers to the expression »Moses caused the manna to descend from heaven» (cf. above pag. 242 *Eccl.R.* 1_{28}) or »the *Torā* was given by Moses». For the derivation of the statement »Moses gave the bread from heaven» from a scriptural passage presenting God as the giver of the manna the passage from *Eccl.R.* quoted above (p. 242) offers an exact parallel. The Rabbinic opinion was certainly *not* that Moses, and not the Holy one, gave the manna, but it *was* the Rabbinic opinion, that Moses' office as the mediator of the manna was a sign and token (a σφραγίς) of his saviourship. Further the gift of the manna was necessarily bound up with Moses and his time, it was something of the past. The expectations of a renewal of the miracle of the manna in the Messianic age only give greater prominence to this linking up with a specific happening and a specific figure of history. Three points must, however, be remembered in order to the right understanding of the contrast between the imperishable food of J and the food of the Jews: (1) the 'manna' was to the Jews, whether it be the Jews as they appear in the Rabbinic sources or in Jn, no mere food for the physical needs of man; the 'manna' was altogether a religious conception, imbued with spiritual meaning; the contrast to the imperishable food spoken of in vss 32 and 49 f. is not — as in vs 26 — a 'physical' food, but the Jewish conception of the spiritual manna, (2) there was in Rabbinic and related Judaism a clear conception of a 'celestial food', 'descending from heaven', that was not historically and necessarily linked up with Moses, but was continuously emanating from heaven; this was connected with the 'manna' as the food for the members of the celestial world, (3) within Rabbinic circles the conceptions of the spiritual *parnāsā* or of the 'bread', the 'food', frequently were mere allegorical expressions for 'the *teaching* of the *Tōrā*'.[1] Hence the antithetical significance of vss 27—32 might be rendered thus: (vs 27) Jesus admonishes the Jews to work for the imperishable, the spiritual, food which he gives them; for he has received the authority (the seal) of God, (vs 28) the Jews understand the expression 'work for the imperishable food' at once in a symbolical or allegorical sense: by the work for the imperishable food Jesus must have meant the 'works' of God, the doing the commandments of God. This identification of ἐργάζεσθαι τήν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον with ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ must be understood as depending altogether on the reasoning of the Jews, not on Jn 4^{34}. The imperishable food was to the Jews the works commanded by God in the Torā, for Tora is called 'food' and Tora gives life to those who do it, in this world and in the world to come (*i.e.* eternal life: μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον)[2] (vs 29) Jesus accepts the identification of the works for imperishable food with the works of God, only he modifies it: there are no 'works of God' without the Son of Man whom God has sent to do his work; all works are comprised in the *one* work (ἔργον vs. ἐργα): 'to believe in Him whom God sent'. Here, indeed, there is an allusion to *Jn 4 34*. The only possibility of doing God's work is to believe in him, who himself is doing the work of God, in unity with God (cf. above p. 188 ll. 4—7). The Jews understand this statement by Jesus: he demands to be acknowledged as a possessor of authority and Divine commission like those possessed by Moses, the first saviour, and expected from the last saviour. He wants to be considered as a *gō'ēl*, 'saviour', a *rōʿǣ n'ǣ'ᵆmān,* 'faithful shepherd'.[3] Hence they, from their point of view, ask J for the tokens of his legitimacy. Moses gave the manna in the desert to the fathers, the last saviour will give the manna to his generation. Show us that you can give us the spiritual gifts which a saviour can mediate! Jesus answers by reminding then of the spiritual continual *parnāsā.* (vs 32) Do not say: Moses gave us bread from heaven in that far away time but realize instead that my Father gives you *now* the true bread from heaven. For Gods' bread (the Divine food) is that which descends from heaven and gives life to the world. So far the Jews, acc. to Jn, are able to follow Jesus. They even ask Jesus to give them of that celestial bread. The real controversy may be said not yet to have begun. (The parallel with the dialogue with the Samaritan woman is so far exact.) What reveals the nature of the contrast is vs 35 ff.: »I am the bread of Life etc.», *i.e.* the view against which Jn 6 is directed, is what may be termed: the externalistic view of the spiritual realities, or, of the means of attainment of spiritual gifts or spiritual life, *i.e.* the view that an earthly being can partake of spiritual, celestial, Divine gifts or know of the Divine worlds or do the Divine will, without entering into the spiritual reality. The externalists are here defined by the words of vs. 36, ἀλλ' εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ ἑωράκατέ με καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε (but I have said to you: although you have seen me, you do not believe). However much the Jews may acknowledge the fact of spiritual realities of the Divine gifts, of the Divine will, they cannot accept them, for although they see externally they do not really see, they are not open to the spiritual world. (Cf. above p. 37 on 1^{51} and p. 99). Against the external attitude of the Jews stands the attitude of those who really 'behold', who have actuated the spiritual element in themselves: (vs 40) τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου ἵνα **πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν** καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, 'every one who beholds the Son (*i.e.* with spiritual eyes sees the Son in his capacity of Son)...'

---

[1] p. 189.

---

[1] cf. above pp. 242, 243.

[2] Cf. *e.g.* *`Ābōþ* 6 7 גדולה התורה שהיא נותנת חיים לעושיה בעולם הזה ובעולם הבא שנאמר כי חיים הם למצאיהם [Prov 4^{22}]

[3] Cf. above p. 138 f. from *Mᵉkiltā* 13 d, 14 a.

This is followed up in particular by vss 45, 46: »It is written in the prophets: 'and they shall be all taught of God'. ›Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me. Not that any man hath seen the Father save he which is of God, he has seen the Father». This is on a line with $5^{37,38}$ (ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ, αὐτὸς μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ· οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε...), 5^{24} (ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με), $3^{31\text{ ff.}}$ (ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος . . . ὁ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ . . . ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής ἐστιν), $3^{11,21}$ (ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν . . . ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ἐν Θεῷ ἐστιν εἰργασμένα). The real sense of the dictum of vss. 45, 46 will not be apparent until, in the light of the passages cited, its character of intentional tautological paradox be comprehended. The paradox is this: no one can come to the Son, without having received the teaching from the Father; no one can hear and learn from the Father except through the Son. The reason for this paradox and its application to the prophetical passage Isa 34 13 of the διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ[1] is that precisely through its paradoxical formulation the reiterated law of the Divine reality should be brought home, *i.e.* the law of all-inclusive identity, union, communion, pervading the whole Divine world. The term διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ acc. to J points to the fact that no real knowledge exists of the Divine world, that does not proceed from God, it points to the internality versus the externality; διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ is to be subsumed under the general γεννηθέντες ἐκ Θεοῦ. Hence, just as no one can enter into the Divine world without being born as a member of that world, as a spiritual being, and as this can only be in and through the Son of Man, so there is no knowledge of the spiritual world without entering into knowledge-communion with the spiritual world, and, in the last instance, with God, and such communion is given only in and through the Son. This communion is a *communion of life.* The nucleus to the section 48—63, from the point of view of the partaking of the Divine reality, is vs 57: καθὼς ἀπέστειλεν με ὁ ζῶν πατήρ, κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὁ τρώγων με κἀκεῖνος ζήσει δὶ ἐμέ, »as the *living* Father hath sent me and I *live* by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me». This utterance, which should be linked up with 5 26 (»as the Father hath life in himself: so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself»), conveys the possession of the Divine Life as a real possession of those who have been born into the spiritual world; this possession of life, however, is not to be viewed as a possession, for each individual, of a separate 'life', a 'life' for himself, as an individual of the terrestrial world may look upon his 'body' as a separate entity, and speak of it as 'my flesh and blood'[2], but the life possessed is the *one* life of the spiritual world, the life of the living Son, living through the Father. To emphasize the all-inclusiveness of the one life of the living Son, it is not be considered as strange, when J resorts to the startling term of 'mastication' for the sharing of life. The 'mastication', then, may be said to stand for 'complete assimilation', 'absorption'. The life of the Son enters into the member of the spiritual world so that it fills his entire being. That the idea of complete absorption and assimilation as contained in the expression 'to eat the spiritual food', was not foreign to the religions thought of the time is shown by the Jewish-mystic-Rabbinic interpretation of the 'food of the angels' as the food that penetrates the whole organism and is absorbed by it.[1]

---

[1] *Vide* Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* p. 118 and also Billerbeck *ad locum.*

[2] *Rabb.:* בשר שלי ודם שלי.

The whole teaching of the 'celestial food' may be summed up as follows:

(1) Those who are open to the spiritual, *i.e.* who actuate the spiritual element in themselves so that it responds to the calling of the spiritual (to the Son's voice), do the work of God,

(2) this consists in the spirit's continuous aspiration to and ascension towards the Son who in himself comprises everything spiritual,

(3) this aspiration consists in, or is founded upon, the *belief* (cf. ch. 3, p. 111) in J, as the 'Messenger', the bringer of the spiritual from the Godhead to man, he who connects the Godhead with man,

(4) the belief, as an ever-increasing, ever-ascending aspiration towards the Godhead, the Divine Life, already implies the actuality of the Divine Life: »he who believes has eternal life» (vs. 47). The belief is a confident assurance of the obtainment of the Divine Life. That this assurance entails the actual possession of this life is in accordance with the Johannine fundamental thesis concerning the Divine-spiritual reality, the thesis to which ch. 6 is especially *devoted:* the belief cannot be an intellectual act within the terrestrial, the psycho-physical, organism of man; it is no belief *about* or *concerning* a thing, for the terrestrial as such cannot in any way grasp the spiritual; to the terrestrial the spiritual is properly non-existent, and if the terrestrial proffers statements concerning the spiritual, these are delusions, lies. The belief is a spiritual activity (or force), going on within the spiritual organism, hence already belonging to the spiritual world, and thereby sharing virtually in the all-pervading Divine Life of that world. The belief is a continous acquisition of the Divine Life, an ἀνάβασις, directed towards the final goal, God Himself. The belief, thus, is a belief *in God.* The ἀνάβασις is an ἀνάβασις in and through the Son; the belief, thus, is a belief *in the Son.* As an actual continuous acquisition of the Divine Life the belief is an acquisition of the Son: just as the believer is continually drawn upwards in the Son as comprising in himself the whole Divine reality, so the believer

---

[1] Cf. above p. 244.

simultaneously may be said continually to draw the Son into himself, to absorb the Divine Life.[1]

(5) The belief is the acceptance of the teaching of Jesus. The teaching is called 'the celestial bread'. But the teaching is no external doctrine after terrestrial manner. It is itself the everlasting life and spiritual reality brought home to man. And since the spiritual reality is the Son, the teaching may be said to be the Son. »I am the bread!» Eating the celestial bread, thus, is this same as, or the continuation of, the believing. It is the assimilation with, the absorption by the spiritual organism of, the Divine Life, of the great spiritual organism: 'the Son'.

(6) The spiritual organism is as real as the earthly organism, which is expressed by the term 'flesh and blood' *(bāsār u̯āđām)*. In order to emphasize this reality Jesus uses the specific term for earthly organism, 'flesh and blood', also for the spiritual organism: 'ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ . . . οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς.

(7) But in order to make it clear that the 'flesh and blood' refer altogether to the spiritual organism, and in no way to terrestrial 'flesh and blood', the utterance is added: »It is the spirit that makes living; the flesh avails nothing», vs. 63. This is in line with the saying: »That which is born of the flesh is flesh and that which is born of the spirit is spirit (3[6])». When thus understood, there is not the slightest divergence between vss. 51—58 and vs. 63; on the contrary, the utterance is what was to be expected; the continuation, »the words that I have spoken unto you, *are* spirit and *are* life», also fits in exactly with what has been propounded above under (5) and also above p. 168 (3).

(8) There is one single sentence that remains as a difficulty to the interpretation here given, viz. the following: ὁ ἄρτος δέ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς (»the bread that I will give is my flesh [given][2] for the life of the world», vs. 51).

---

[1] This reciprocity is clearly expressed by vs. 56: ». . . *dwelleth in me* and *I in him*».

[2] In Aramaic:

ולחמא דאנא אתניניה בסרי הוא על חייא דעלמא

The reconstruction of the sentence into Aramaic, thus, removes the difficulties of construction inherent in the Greek text. Much discussion has been given to the absence of the article ἡ (or ὁ) before ὑπέρ, or to the possibility of connecting ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς directly with δώσω. The latter is without discussion taken for granted by H. Delafosse (*Le quatrième évangile*, p. 159): »et le pain que je donnerai pour la vie du monde c'est ma chair».

The 'flesh' is here evidently *not* an expression of the reality of the spiritual organism, but the expression of the appearance of J in the earthly world, of the fact that he has been born into a human earthly organism. The word σάρξ (flesh) is here used in the same sense as 1^{14}: »and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us». The 'flesh for the life of the world', further, is on a line with $3^{16,17}$: 'God so loved the world that he *gave his only begotten Son*, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. For *God sent not His Son into the world* to condemn the world; but that *the world through him might be saved*' (= for the life of the world). The 'flesh for the life of the world' is thus identical with 'the Son's κατάβασις into earthly existence in order to bring the Divine Life down to the world'.[1] J's earthly appearance, his σάρξ, may be defined as the vehicle for the revelation of God's love, or for the spiritual reality. By this vehicle Jesus speaks words that are received by the ears and minds of earthly men, and, in the case of those who 'do the truth', awaken the dormant spiritual element in men, so that they are able to 'hear his (spiritual) voice', the calling of spirit to spirit. In this sense the 'words' of Jesus in the flesh may be said to be celestial bread, namely the bread of the descended Son. And the 'bread', to go further, may be identified with the earthly activity of the incarnated Son in its totality, and if that activity is what is meant by the word σάρξ, the sentence in question might be considered not very far removed in general bearing from the rest of the discourse.[2]

---

[1] This is evidently, on the supposition of essential and consistent unity of thought in Jn, the primary connotation. Reference to the coming death of J is not implied in any other sense than that this in common with the final glorification forms part of the process set in by J's κατάβασις in the flesh; the future 'δώσω' demonstrates nothing in this respect, since the ministration of Life to the believers or to the 'world' is always to be assigned both to the present and to the future. An exact parallel to the δώσω of 6^{51} is that of 4^{14}. Nor is there — on the same ground — any reference to the future instigation of the Eucharist: ὑπέρ of *1 Cor* 11^{24} etc. has no *demonstrating* force.

[2] The exposition by Büchsel (*Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus*, p. 50) might be adduced here: »Der Gegensatz, gegen den diese Rede sich richtet, besteht im Anstoss an der allzu irdischen Art der Gabe (V. 31) und Person Jesu (V. 42). Demgegenüber betont Jesus, *dass man ihn in* ***seiner irdischen Art so, wie er ist, hinnehmen muss,*** und steigert die Ausdrücke dafür (V. 57, 58) so, dass es schliesslich heisst: wer mich kaut (V. 57)». This interpretation would be applicable also to vs. 51, and would be supported by the »objection to Jesus derived from his lowly origin» (Strachan) voiced by vss. 42 ff. The sense would be: even in his sarcical, *i.e.* earthly, manifestation, the Son is the bread descended

The parts of the discourse relating to the κατάβασις of the spiritual and to the Son's function as including in him both the ἀνάβασις, and the κατάβασις are perfectly natural and, moreover, necessary, constituents of it, when viewed in the light of the previous exposition. 6^{32} οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν has been dwelt upon already above p. 255. 6^{33} ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ; just as the germ of eternal life acc. to ch. 3 (cf. above p. 112) must be given from above, so the real *Divine* bread is a bread that descends from the divine world, the 'heaven' *(rāqīᵃʿ, rᵉqīᵃʿ ʿᵃrāḇōp̄).* 6^{35} ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, I am that bread, descended from heaven, every Divine gift, efflux from above, is comprised in the Son, *is* the Son. 6^{37} πᾶν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἥξει καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρός με οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω, כל דיהב (דמסר) לי אבא לגבי ייתי ומאן דאתי לגבי לית אנא רמי [מנדי, מדחי] לברא[1] The view representing this dictum together with others of the same kind as intended for a solution of the problem of the unbelief of the Jews in the sense that it is the Divine Will that decides whether man shall believe or not, must be rejected as highly misleading. The characterization of the believers as 'those whom my Father has given me' is an instance of the peculiarly Jn-ine way of expressing the complete dependence of the Son upon the Father insolubly connected with his complete authority. That this is the object in view is apparent from the immediate sequel, 6^{38}: ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με. The πᾶν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατήρ etc. is on line with $3^{35\text{f.}}$ ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱόν καὶ **πάντα δέδωκεν** ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, **ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν** ἔχει ξωὴν αἰωνιον, with

---

from heaven, he is the 'Word' made flesh. The emphasis, then, is clearly upon the spiritual revealed in J, the celestial Father appearing in him, so that vs. 63 even in this case follows naturally: »the spirit is the life-giving, the flesh avails nothing» *(nišmᵉp̄a hī dimᵉḥaii̯a bisrā laip̄ mahnē kᵉlūm).*

[1] It is to be observed that the construction πᾶν ὅ is easily understood with the background of an Aramaic *kol dᵉ,* which latter stands equally for 'every one who', 'all who' and 'all that', 'everything that'. It should not, however, be treated as a mistranslation in the sense of a translation footed on a misunderstanding of the original, but instead as a more or less unsuccessful attempt at rendering into Greek the Aramaic sense of 'the totality of'. A writer, thinking in Aramaic, would be inclined to feel the expression πάντα ὅν or πάντας οὕς to be a less adequate rendering of כל ד than πᾶν ὅ. Notice the parallel, in vs. 39, with the supplementary αὐτό.

18^{37} πᾶς ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκούει μου τῆς φωνῆς, 3^{21} ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τῆν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἐστιν εἰργασμένα, and with 6^{44} and 10^{29}. To belong to those 'given by the Father' is = to 'be of the truth' = to belong to those who listen to the Son, who respond to the spiritual. As actual or potential sharers in the spiritual world they are given to the Son. Since the Father is the source of the all-pervading Divine Life of the spiritual world, it is certainly true to say that He is also the ground for and source of the spiritual element in man. It is true that »man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven» (3^{27}). But it is false to deduce from these statements an answer to the problem, whether the reason for man's acceptance of Jesus is to be sought in his own will or in God's will. The Jn-ine system of thought implies on the contrary that this very problem is to be rejected as wholly irrelevant: it is an external problem. Strangely enough the correlating problem, whether the unbelief should be deduced from man's own will or from a Divine decree, does not appear equally irrelevant. It is to be answered quite positively: the unbelief is founded upon a corruption of man's own inclination, whereby he identifies himself with, merges himself entirely into, the world of darkness, falsehood, externality. This corruption of man's own inclination causes him to shut himself against the spiritual: 6^{36}.[1]

In fact, the words of $6^{37\,b}$ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρός με οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω may be said to be a direct refutation of the notion that insensibility to the spiritual depends upon the Son's arbitrament. He does not reject or shut out anyone from the spiritual. His work with regard to those who actuate the spiritual within themselves, and hence come to him, is devoted entirely to drawing them ever upwards, filling them evermore with the Divine. In this he acts in complete dependence upon the Divine will: (6^{38}) ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με. The Son's work consequent upon his κατάβασις, is to bring about the continuous ἀνάβασις, ascension, of the believers in the Divine-spiritual world, towards the final goal: the complete life *in* the Father: (6^{39}) τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με ἵνα πᾶν ὁ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ. The μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ is the counterpart to οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω, and might be translated: 'that . . . I should not lose (cause to be lost, perish, vanish) *from Him*'; the believers, being *in* the Divine world, are virtually *in* the Father as they are in the Son (cf. 17^{21-26})[1]; ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ; these words, then, represent the final goal of the Son's work with the believer's, *viz.*, to repeat: the conferment upon them of the complete life in the Father.[2] The vs. links up with 5^{29} and is not additional (cf. also above p. 100 ll. 1—5).

---

[1] Bauer's statement (*Joh. Ev.*², p. 93) »Mit 36 schweift der Evangelist vom Hauptthema ab, um sich erst 41 zurückzufinden und von 44—46 aufs neue den Faden zu verlieren. Man kann Zweifel daran hegen, ob diese Teile zum ursprünglichen Bestand des Abschnittes gehören. Ihr Verfasser ringt mit dem Problem des Unglaubens der Juden. Dieser noch 5^{40} auf ihrem bösen Willen beruhend, wird 37 auf seinen letzten Grund zurückgeführt: Gottes Wille (vgl. Rm 9—11)» is in every detail unfounded. The Evangelist never looses his thread. The doubt concerning the passage in question is only born of Bauer's prepossessed interpretation. The Evangelist (or the author of 36—40, 44—46) does not wrestle with problems of thought. He only wrestles with the problem, how to express in words what to him is absolute truth. 6^{37} is not the explanation of 6^{36}, as Bauer treats it, but contains the antithesis to the unbelief of the external, terrestrial minds, viz. the *eo-ipso* belief of those who are open to the spiritual and thereby already sharers in the Divine world, and hence belong to the Father's world and by him are committed to the Son.

6^{42-45}; the believers' ascent, their drawing into themselves the Celestial life (= the Celestial Bread), is correlative with the Father's drawing them to Himself. This is contained in the κατάβασις of the Son from His Father to those who believe in Him. But just as the Son is completely dependent upon His Father, so the believers, as believers, are dependent on the Father. They live only in and through Him. The *antithesis* between *Jesus as the son of Josef* (in the mouth of the Jews: 6^{42}) and the *Son of the »Father who sent me»* (6^{44}) is brought out clearly, and followed up in vss. 46 and 51 (»he who is from the Father»). There should be no doubt but that the κατάβασις is *a real 'descent', the descent of a transcendent and preexistent being: the Son. It is this transcendent being who »has been sent»*.[3] 6^{44} is a repeated expression of the absolute communion between the Father and the Son, the complete dependence of the Son upon the Father, and the complete

---

[1] This change of reading is, of course, a mere conjecture. One might construct in Aramaic: *hāđa hī s^eƀūpā d^ešāl^eḥi d^ekol dihaƀ li lā 'ōƀēd minnēh*, of which the Greek of vs. 39 would be a word for word reproduction, but which carries the sense of the conjecture given above.

[2] *Aramaic:* אלא אקימיניה ביומא בתראה [אחריא]. It might be discussed whether ἀναστήσω would correspond to אקים or to אחייה. For the expression the 'last day' the Mandæan expression *'iōmā bāprāiā'* (the 'last day') as the day of resurrection and judgement should be remembered (*Ginza Right* XI 253^{22}) (*Pet* 252^{8}). The Mandæan literature uses the verb *'qayyem'* for 'resurrect'.

[3] The import of the presented difficulty of the Jews to understand how the son of Joseph, of parents known to them, could proclain himself as de-

---

scended from heaven, is not easily grasped. Once it should be recalled that the idea of a high celestial spirit *(n^ešāmā)* as descending into an earthly being was not foreign to Jewish thought. Jewish mysticism of the early second century A.D. held as a central tenet that the Divine *n^ešāmā* of the First Adam (*i.e.* the First Spirit-Man) descended from heaven into and joined itself with the spirit of 'prominently righteous men' of subsequent ages (the Watchers of the ages), such as Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Elias, etc. (*Vide 3 En, Introd.* pp. 122 f.) The *n^ešāmā* could speak of itself, »I am Elias», »I am Enoch etc.», and, *vice versa* the earthly bearer could speak of himself in the name of the *n^ešāmā*: I am etc. who descended from heaven (*Pirqē·d^e R. Ĭšmaʿel,* cf. also *3 En* 4^{2}). This idea was also known to Rabbinic Judaism of the late first and early second century, as is seen from a comparison between Philo's haggada on Genesis 1—3 and the Clementine *Hom* 2^{51}, 3^{20}, 17^{4}, 18^{8}, *Recogn.* i 52 ii 22 on one hand and the haggada of *Genesis Rabba* on Genesis 1—3 on the other. What is specially significant, however, is that Rabbinic Judaism *rejects* the said idea without, however, being able to suppress the conceptions allied with it, viz. (1) that of the 'Light taken from Adam when he sinned and preserved in heaven for the righteous' (*GenR* 11 2) — which conception has no significance except as an integral part of the idea of the Spirit of the First Adam as a Divine 'Essence' brought down into terrestrial mankind. — (2) The conception of the *Š^ekinā* as dwelling on Adam until he sinned but removed from him with his sin, yet brought down again by (*i.e.* in) the righteous (cf. quotation from *P^esiqpā, GenR* and *CantR* above p. 92) as the carriers of the age, the pillars of the world. (3) The connection between Adam and Abraham (and other prominent saints). *Vide GenR* 14 6 and the dictum: ברא הקב''ה את אברהם באמצע הדורות כדי שיסבול דורות שלפניו ודורות שלאחריו »The Holy One created Abraham in the midst of the generations in order that he should carry the generations before him and the generations after him.» (4) the 'glory' *(kāƀōđ,* aram. *i^eqārā)* a reflex of the Divine glory, possessed by Adam,. taken away with his sin (*GenR* 11 2, 12 5). (5) The conception of Messiah as *'the last Saviour'*, who will bring down what was lost by Adam (*GenR* 12 5).

Further, it is to be noticed that the controversial point of 6^{42-44} is similar to that of 7^{27-29} and that both passages quoted prefocus 8^{54-58}.

Lastly, the antithesis between the earthly and celestial origin of Jesus should be viewed in the light of the general Jn-ine doctrine of the antithesis between terrestrial and celestial birth, and consequently, in relation to the controversial implications of that doctrine (cf. above pp. 50 and note 1, 51—55, 63, 64).

On these considerations it might be argued that the controversial significance of 6^{42-44} is somewhat as follows: (1) the Jews do not reject the idea that a man appearing on earth as an earthly being could be descended from heaven; they maintained that Elijah and other celestial figures appeared on earth and dwelt among men as earthly beings; (2) neither do they reject the idea, that a man, born of known parents, of 'woman', of 'earthly semen', could receive a Divine calling, be a messenger from God, obtain revelations from the Divine world; (3) but they rejected the idea that a man born of earthly semen could authority conferred upon the Son by the Father. It is hence to be connected with 5^{19}: οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν, ἂν μὴ τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα· ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ. The relation of these utterances to the law of unity and all-inclusiveness of the spiritual world has been referred to above. With regard to the experience of the believers 6^{44} is to be connected with 4^{23}: 'The Father *seeks* such (men) to worship him' (*vide* above p. 173) *i.e.* as an expression of a κατάβασις emanating from the Father, and also with $3^{14\text{ f.}}$ (*vide* above pp. 99 f.) together with 12^{32}: 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me'. *The ἀνάβασις of the believer, the ὑψωθῆναι of the Son in relation the believer, the κατάβασις of the Son, the ἑλκύειν of the Father and the Son in communion in respect of the believers, are merely different aspects of one continuous process of spiritual experience, i.e.* of the experience of the Divine Life, emerging in its final consummation: the ἀνάστασις of the last day, the definite and final entrance into the Divine existence.[1]

$6^{48, 50\,a, 51\,a, c, 55, 58}$ might be passed shortly, since the significance of these passages from the aspect of κατάβασις is already

---

at the same time be a celestial being, of celestial origin, could have »descended from heaven». Clearly the idea of the appearance of celestial beings on earth implied in no sense the descent of the Divine from heaven to earth in that being; the only 'descent' in the mystical sense is, acc. to Rabbinic Judaism, the descent of *Šᵉkinā* (cf. above p. 94 ll. 3—8). (4) It is entirely false to say that J 'ignores the controversial utterance of the Jews completely' (Bauer, *J. Ev.*², p. 93). On the contrary vs. 44 answers vs. 42 on every point. Against the opinion of the Jews J puts his doctrine of the absolute contrast between the earthly and spiritual; earthly birth, hence, has nothing to do with spiritual origin. As this applies to men in general, so it applies also to Jesus. Acc. to his earthly birth he is truly the son of earthly parents, but to his spiritual origin he is the Son of the *'Father'*. Further: of his spiritual origin only those who have entered the spiritual world can know, but everyone who *has* entered that world *of necessity* knows J's spiritual origin and comes to him. The Jews know only of his earthly origin.

[1] The use of ἑλκύειν as the expression of a religious experience is idiomatic in Rabbinic literature. Cf. *e.g.Cant R* 1_{25}: »with what does God draw Israel so that it 'runs after Him' (Cant. 1^{4})?» The teachers said:

ממה שהשרית שכינתך בתוכנו כדכתיב ועשו לי מקדש אחריך נרוצה ורבנין
אמרין חורי על שסלקת שכינתך מתוכנו אחריך נרוצה

With the presence of the Šᵉkinā on earth God draws Israel, and with the ascension of the Šᵉkinā from an earth, God draws them (viz. in pursuance of the Šᵉkinā). *Ib.:* »Just as a wife follows her husband wherever he 'draws' her (from place to place) or as Israel followed Moses whitherever he drew them, so they are drawn by and follow the Holy One, for they are avid (להוטים) of him.

implied in the corresponding aspect of ἀνάβασις dealt with above. The identifications: ἐγώ (J) = ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς = ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων = ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν = ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω = ἡ σάρξ μου, are in perfect keeping with the doctrine of the Fourth Gospel. The Son is the Living One — who gives Life — in giving Himself — descending from heaven — from the Father to earthly beings.

6^{57}. This utterance is a strong point of support for the interpretation here urged. Linking up with 5^{25}, speaking of the Son and the Father as having Life in themselves, it may be said to give an actual explanation of the choice of the strange expression of τρώγειν. The explanation is: τρώγειν = ζῆν δι' ἐμέ. It is used to point out that in the spiritual world, whose members have real spiritual organisms, *there is no separateness of organisms, but the Life consists in an assimilation with the spiritual organism of the Son,* the spiritual life is not a life in oneself but a life in the Son, who himself lives in the Father.

6^{62}, which to a superficial reading seems quite unconnected with 6^{61} as well as with the preceding discourse, actually introduces the natural sequel to that discourse. The interpretations of this vs. are manifold. To quote Bauer (who follows O. and H. Holtzmann): in vs. 62 Jesus does not intend to increase the σκάνδαλον but instead to solve the riddle of his paradoxical speech. His ascension to heaven will show that he has not meant to enjoin anthropophagy. The vers is an aposiopesis and its latter part would be, *e.g.:* »how could you then (when the Son of Man shall have ascended) eat his flesh?» This might be correct to a certain degree. But that such a statement could have any force at all in the mouth of one, whose sole or main object is to teach the necessity of the partaking of the Eucharistic eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ (— as Bauer interprets it —) is incomprehensible. It might be comprehensible in the mouth of scoffers who wanted to put ridicule upon the belief of the Christian Church with regard to the nature of the elements of the Eucharist. In fact, what Kreyenbühl[2] says of this piece of exegesis is, from a critical standpoint, singularly adequate. The interpretation in question, he says, is right in treating the aposiopesis as a removal of the σκάνδαλον (offence). But the σκάνδαλον itself did *not* consist in the idea of anthropophagy, either with the Jews, or with Jesus

---

[1] *J. Ev.*^{2}, p. 97.

[2] *Das Evangelium der Wahrheit,* vol. ii, p. 79.

or with the disciples. The 'offence' is on the contrary this: that J, with regard to his 'sarcical' origin so well-known, declares himself to be the *celestial* bread, a *celestial* gift. Hence, when he points to his *ascent*, this does not imply a pointing out of the impossibility of an anthropophagy in respect of the ascended Christ, but instead a confirmation of his καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ: his ἀνάβασις will show that he is really of celestial origin. So far Kreyenbühl may be followed.[1]

The full understanding of the passage will be attained by adding to the observations by Kreyenbühl the following considerations: (1) The θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου retrospects on vs 40: πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν *ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον*. In both cases, hence, the θεωρεῖν refers to a spiritual vision[2], the object of which is the Son. (2) The mode of expression 6^{62} further clearly alludes to two passages in the preceding, viz. 1^{51} ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ **ἀναβαίνοντας** καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν **υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου** and $3^{14,15}$ ... οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, of which the former, as we have seen, refers to the opening of the faculty of vision in the spiritual world, by which the believers »will see the connexion being brought about between the celestial appearance, the δόξα of Christ, and his appearance in the flesh» (cf. above pp. 36, 40) and the latter, to repeat, »refers to a spiritual experience with the believer, in which the Son of Man as united with him and abiding in him, is elevated to the believer's spiritual gaze, so that the believer *ascends* in aspiring ever upwards towards the δόξα of the Celestial Son of Man» (cf. above p. 99). The significance of the aposiopesis, then, is quite simple. It might be reduced to this statement: »The offence which you now take in my words will be removed, when once you will have entered the spiritual world, when your spiritual eyes shall have been opened. Then you will see me ascending to the abode whence I come, and where I am, that of the Father.»[1] From this understanding $6^{63\,a}$ follows of itself: »it is the spirit that gives life, the σάρξ avails nothing».[2]

---

[1] The sequel to Kreyenbühl's analysis is here as elsewhere its application to his hypothesis, viz. that the speaker, the ἐγώ, is in reality, not J, but the Gnostic Menander. The Jews are the members of the organized Church, the 'disciples' are the disciples of Menander, and the offence taken by them was that he put 'the Eternal Life' in the place of the sacrament of the Church, although he himself was a mere human being of earthly-sarcial origin and hence could have no authority like that of Jesus, of the Great Church, and of the Institution of the Eucharist.

[2] cf. Abbot, *Johannine Vocabulary*, p. 106 (1598).

$6^{63\,b}$ τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωή ἐστιν. This is not intended as a definition or qualification of πνεῦμα and ζωή, as if J would say: the Spirit and the Life really consist in my words, but it is a qualification of the words which J (ἐγώ) speaks, in contrast to other words: *his* words are spiritual and living. If a modern mind might be inclined to fasten upon this verse and to see there an evidence of what he would call a 'spiritualized conception of religion', it must be maintained that exactly what this modern mind calls 'spiritualized' is to Jn the very opposite, viz. quite as external and un-spiritual as earthly 'flesh and blood'. What a modern, or else philosophical, mind would regard as the most immaterial of all, *e.g.* speculations upon 'absolute truths', 'pure thought', *e.a.*, to Jn belongs to the sphere of reality described by the expression 'that which is born of flesh is flesh'. Just as J's teaching is not a doctrine that can be expressed in words comprehensible to an intelligent earthly mind (cf. ch. 4), or as his μαρτυρία is not an *external* μαρτυρία, so his 'words' are no mere words in the sense in which they are uttered and accepted or rejected by terrestrial beings. His words are to be understood as belonging to the spiritual world, and *the words of the spiritual world are spiritual realities, living entities,* viz. actually He himself. In His words He gives Himself, and therely the spiritual Life.

$6^{68,69}$ contains the typical confession of one who has had his spiritual eyes opened: πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα, ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις· καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. The πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα alludes to the expression ἔρχεσθαι πρός of the discourse; it is the confession in the mouth of a believer of the experience of which J has spoken (*e.g.* $6^{37,45}$): »thou art the sole possessor of the spiritual things, the giver of the spiritual gifts. We have believed (taken the step into the spiritual) and know (with spiritual knowledge, as members of the spiritual world) that thou art God's Holy One.» This believer has already 'seen the Son of Man ascending up where he was before'.

---

[1] The final 'glorification' is implied, but does not constitute the *primary* sense.

[2] For the ἀνάβασις-significance of this vs. cf. above p. 260.

7$^{3-8}$. The main difficulty of the discourse part of the section 7$^{1-13}$ adheres to vs. 6: ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὔπω πάρεστιν, ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος πάντοτέ ἐστιν ἕτοιμος. The antithetical formulation points to a deeper meaning than the obvious one[1], and since the antitheses of Jn regularly subsume under the one, great, antithesis: viz. that between the Divine-spiritual and the terrestrial, it is to be expected that such is the case also here. Thus the καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός would connote some spiritual καιρός, or a καιρός connected with the spiritual οὐσία of J, whereas ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος would refer to the terrestrial καιρός or to the terrestrial καιρός-conditions. But a comparison with other antitheses of this kind, *e.g.* between spiritual and terrestrial birth, spiritual and terrestrial teaching and knowledge, Divine and external μαρτυρία, at once makes it evident that the present antithesis cannot without difficulty be put on a line with the named contrasts. The difficulty is this: the spiritual entities of the said antitheses always include the whole spiritual world, they reveal the all-inclusiveness of the Divine world; the καιρός, again — so it seems — cannot be claimed to be identical with the spiritual reality itself. The spiritual καιρός is ’not present’, it is spoken of not as a spiritual entity, but as a point of time. One might even add the following consideration: it would, *theoretically,* have been quite possible and in keeping with the Jn-ine system, to have spoken of a spiritual καιρός that, in contrast to the terrestrial, would be ’always ready or present’. Here on the contrary, the spiritual καιρός is evidently = the *appointed time* for a specific event of some kind or other. These observations are absolutely necessary to an understanding of the Jn-ine conception of καιρός (here) and ὥρα (in general).

---

[1] The obvious meaning is aptly described by Archbishop Bernard (*ICC* i 269): ’καιρός is a word which Jn uses only in this passage; it stands for the moment of opportunity, the fitting occasion, rather than for the »predistined hour» (ὥρα), on which the Fourth Gospel dwells with such insistence. The fitting time had not yet come, Jesus says in reply to the suggestion, »reveal thyself to the world» (v. 4); and by this is meant not the hour of His Passion, but rather the best time for that public manifestation of Himself as Messiah, which He would make when He went up to the Feast of Tabernacles (v. 8). Such public declaration was made, when He did go up: cf. vv. 29, 33, 8$^{12, 28}$ etc.

ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος πάντοτέ ἐστιν ἕτοιμος. Their case is different from His. It did not matter when they went up to the feast, it was one of strict obligation, but the exact day on which they would present themselves in Jerusalem was of no consequence, provided that they attended. Any day would be a fitting day (καιρός) for them to arrive, for *they* would not be received with hostility, but rather with indifference.

As typical for the *Rabbinic* conception of the 'appointed time' may be cited *GenR* 3_8:

א״ר יהודה ב״ר סימון יהי ערב אכ״כ. אלא ויהי ערב מכאן שהיה סדר זמנים קודם לכן

»R. Yᵉhuđā said in the name of R. Simon: it is not written: 'let it be evening', but 'and it became evening'. Thence we know that the the institution of appointed times *(séđær zᵉmannīm)* existed before that.»

The *séđær zᵉmannīm* does not mean 'time', 'time-order', in the philosophical sense of the term. It does not mean merely the institution of seasons or measure of time. It means the institution of appointed times *(zᵉmannīm)* for every thing, visible and invisible, celestial and terrestrial. The Rabbinic idea is that the *zᵉmannīm* are of Divine, pre-existent, eternal origin, are implied in the Divine will itself as it is of eternity. The *zᵉmānnīm*, therefore, had no connection with the origin of the world: this origin was itself dependent upon its *zᵉmān* (*vide* below).

This conception is fundamental with Jewish Rabbinic thought. The rationale for its formulation in the present and similar passages on the other hand, should probably be sought in the confrontation with philosophical speculations concerning the origin of 'time'.

One might compare *e.g.* the Philonic comments on the same Scripture passage, for instance in *Opif. mundi* 9: »And these, I mean *morning and evening*, must be placed in the class of incorporeal things, perceptible only by the intellect; for there is absolutely nothing in them which is perceptible by the external senses, but they are entirely ideas, and measures, and forms, and seals, incorporeal as far as regards the generation of other bodies. But when light came, and darkness retreated and yielded to it, and boundaries were set in the space between the two, namely, evening and morning, *then of necessity the measure of time was immediately perfected,* which also the Creator called day, and He called it not 'the first day' but 'one day' and it is spoken of thus, on account of the single nature of the world perceptible only by the intellect, which has a single nature.» (Yonge; . . . κατὰ τ᾽ἀναγκαῖον τοῦ χρόνου μέτρον ἀπετελεῖτο εὐθύς, ὃ καὶ ἡμέραν ὁ ποιῶν ἐκάλεσεν, καὶ ἡμέραν οὐχὶ πρώτην, ἀλλὰ μίαν, ἣ λέλεκται διὰ τὴν τοῦ νοητοῦ κόσμου μόνωσιν μοναδικὴν ἔχοντος φύσιν».) Cf. *ib.* 7, »It therefore follows also of necessity that time was created either at the same moment with the world, or later than it — and to venture to assert that it is older than the world is absolutely inconsistent with philosophy.» Cf. also *ib.* 4, *De Imm. Dei* (God the creator of time, being the father of its father, κόσμος; the time the grandson of God, cf. *Corp. Herm.* cited above p. 119). Philo is clearly dependent on philosophic speculations, going back to Plato's *Timaios* and Poseidonion's commentary on *Timaios*. His mode of reasoning, however, also betrays familiarity with the Rabbinic Haggāđā.

It should be noted that, in spite of the fact that the conception of the *z*^{e}*mannīm* and the speculations on the origin of 'time' were actually confronted with each other, they apparently belong to entirely different spheres of thought. There seems to be no reason why the conception of the *z*^{e}*mannīm* should clash with speculations on the χρόνος at all. The quest for a possible solution of this problem would seem to point towards the complex of ideas, that might represented by the series *zurvan* — αἰών — χρόνος — Κρόνος — καιρός.[1] The conception of the *zurvān* itself, evidently, is far removed from that of the *z*^{e}*mannīm*. The conception of the *zurvan*, sooner, touches that of the χρόνος of Philo. As a name of the Deity it should, as Schæder[2] very ingeniously has shown, be compared with the Jewish *māqōm* (viā τόπος). Similarly, the conceptions evolving out of astrological speculations are not sufficient to explain the specific colour of the *z*^{e}*mannīm*-idea. The astrological conceptions actually subsist side by side with, and sometimes in close conjunction with, the *z*^{e}*mannīm*-idea.[3]

Although the *zurvān*—καιρός complex and the astrological conceptions do not suffice to explain the *z*^{e}*mannīm*-idea, there are, however, instances of a similar idea in Iranian religion, which idea, again, as it happens, is frequently combined with the conception of *zurvān* and with astrological notions. That is the idea, evolved from the speculations on the world-ages, of appointed times for the appearance of certain events, and, especially, as is natural, for the revelation and activity of the Messenger or Saviour. To follow this idea in its details would fall outside our present scope, but it might not be inopportune to quote some relevant pehlevi passages.

---

[1] *Vide* Reitzenstein, *Iran. Erlös. Myst.*, pp. 177 ff.

[2] *Iranische Lehren* pp. 320 f. Cf. also Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* p. 181 on Philo's polemics against the identification of יהוה with the Syro-Phoenician Time-God.

[3] It might be assumed, for instance, that the *z*^{e}*mannīm*-idea would have to be explained as the result of the subsumption of the astrological conceptions under the central Jewish notion of the absolute omnipotence and authority of God. But whereas such a subsumption is actually to be observed in the Jewish astrological speculations, the *z*^{e}*mannīm*-idea is clearly to its origin and setting independent of the astrological ideas.

Zād-sparam 4^{4-10} (E. W. West) »And he (*scil.* Aharman) sends Astō-vīdād upon him with the thousand decrepitudes (aūzvāranō) and diseases which are his own, sicknesses of various kinds, so that they may make him ill and cause death. Gāyōmard was not secured by them, and the reason was because it *was a decree of appointing Time (zōrvānō)* in the beginning of the coming in of Aharman, that: '*Up to thirty winters I appoint Gāyōmard unto brilliance and preservation of life*'. And his manifestation in the celestial sphere was through the forgiveness of criminals and instigators of confusion *by his good works*, and for that reason *no opportunity was obtained by them during the extent of thirty years*. ... For in the beginning it was so appointed that the star Aūharmazd was life towards the creatures, ... and Kēvān was death towards the creatures etc.» The astrological speculations are in this passage obvious accretions; they are foisted upon an original conception of a plan of *zurvān* implying the existence of an appointed time for the appearance, the works, and the death, of the Saviour (Gāyōmard).

Similarly the following passage might be adduced:

Dīnāī Maīnōgī-Khīrad $27^{10, 11}$ »Because the affairs of the world of every kind proceed through destiny and time and the supreme decree of the self-existent eternity (zōrvān), the king and long-continuing lord. Since, at various periods, it happens unto every one, for whom it is allotted, just as that which is necessary to happen.»[1]

To elucidate the Rabbinic use of the idea of *zᵉmannim* some further quotations are needed. It should be observed that synonymously with *zᵉman* also *šāʿā* and *ʿōnā* are used for 'appointed time'.

GenR 9_{2}

תנחומא פתח את הכל עשה יפה בעתו א״ר תנחומא בעונתו נברא העולם
לא היה העולם ראוי לבראות קודם לכן

»Opening with the Scripture passage (Eccl. 3^{11}) 'He hath made every thing beautiful in his time', R. Tanḥuma said: '*The world*

---

[1] On *zurvan* cf. further *Zād-sparam* 1^{24-27} (time as a creation of Auharmazd), *Dadistānī Dīnīk* 37^{16} (the unlimited time), *Sīkand Gumanīk Vigār* $16^{31, 79, 80}$ (speculative in character).

was created in its appointed time (ʿōnā). The world was not worthy (or rather 'appropriate') *to be created before that.'*»

M. Baba Mᵉṣiʿā 3 7

הכל לפי המדה הכל לפי הזמן

»everything is according to measure and everything is according to (appointed) time».

TY Taʿᵃnīp̄ 1 1:

הכל לפי המאורע הכל לפי הזמן

»everything according to the occasion, everything according to the (appointed) time».

Cf. *TB Taʿᵃnīp̄* 14 b

הכל לפי השנים הכל לפי המקומות הכל לפי הזמן

Pirqē ʾĀbōp̄ 4 3

הוא היה אומר אל תהי בז לכל אדם ואל תהי מפליג לכל דבר שאין לך
אדם שאין לו שעה ואין לך דבר שאין לו מקום

»He (*scil.* Ben ʿAzzai) said: despise no man and carp not at any thing; for there is not a man *that has not his hour,* and there is not a thing that *has not its place.*» The idea here is that every being and every thing has its appointed time and place of activity and existence within which it preserves its full worth and — so it may be concluded — cannot be surpassed by any other being or thing.

TB Šab 10 a

רבא חזייה לרב המנונא דקא מאריך בצלותיה אמר מניחין חיי העולם
ועוסקים בחיי שעה והוא סבר זמן תפלה לחוד וזמן תורה לחוד רבי
ירמיה הוה יתיב קמיה דר׳ זירא והוו עסקי בשמעתא נגה לצלויי והוה
קא מסרהב ר׳ ירמיה קרא עליה רבי זירא מסיר אזנו משמוע תורה גם
תפלתו תועבה

»Rabba saw R. Hamnuna prolonging his prayer. He said: they leave the eternal life and occupy themselves with the life of the hour. For he was of the opinion: '*the time of prayer apart* and *the time of Tora apart*'. R. Irmᵉyā was sitting before R. Zēra and they occupied themselves with (the study of) the traditions.

It grew dark (and the time) for prayer (approached). Then R. Irmᵉyā hurried (with his reading of the hᵃlāk̄ā); then R. Zēra recited (the following Scripture passage, applying it) on him: 'He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination' (Prov. 28^{9}).»

TB Sanh. 101 a

כל הקורא פסוק בזמנו מביא טובה לעולם

»every one who reads (each) Scripture-passage in its appointed time brings blessing on the world» (Prov. 15^{23}).

Deut. R. 2_{7}

א״ר חייא רבה . . . הוי מתפלל וחוזר ומתפלל ויש שעה שיתנו לך

»R. Ḥiyya Rabba said: '. . . pray and pray again, and there is *a time* that they shall give thee'», *i.e.* continue praying, and know that at the appointed time God will give thee that for which *you have been* praying.

Qoh. R. 3_{1}

לכל זמן ועת לכל חפץ. זמן היה לאדה״ר שיכנס לג״ע . . . וזמן היה לו שיצא משם . . . זמן היה לו לנח שיכנס לתיבה . . . וזמן היה לו לצאת . . . זמן היה לאברהם שינתן לו המילה . . . וזמן היה לבניו להמול . . . ועת לכל חפץ תחת השמים זמן היה שתנתן התורה לישראל א״ר ביבי זמן היה לאותו דבר שהיה נתון למעלה מן השמים ועכשיו יהיה נתון למטא מן השמים ואיזו זו התורה

Yalquṭ Šimʿōnī 968 (to Eccl. 3^{1})

ועת לכל חפץ זמן היה לאותו חפץ שהיה בשמים שינתן לארץ ואיזה זה תורת

»(Eccl. 3^{1}): 'To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven.' There was a *time (zᵉman) for the first man,* that he should enter the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2^{15}) and there was a time for him that he should go out from it (Gen. 3^{24}) there was a *time for Noah* that he should enter the ark (Gen. 7^{1}) and there was a time for him to go out (Gen. 8^{16}). There was a *time for Abraham,* that he should be given the circumcision (Gen. 17^{9}) and there was a time for his children to be circumcized . . . 'and a time for every thing (so the miđraš) under heaven': there was a time that the Tōrā should be given to Israel. R. Beb̄ai said: there was a *time (appointed) for that thing which had been given above the heavens* (*scil.* to the celestial worlds, the angels) and now should be given below the heavens. And what was that? It was the Tōrā.» (*Yalquṭ Šimʿoni* preserves the reading:) »'And a time for every thing'. A time was for *that thing which was in heaven that it should be given to the earth.* And what was that? (answer:) It was the Tōrā.»

M^{e}kiltā v, 3 c

היה רבי מתיא בן חרש אומר ואעבור עליך ואראך והנה עתך עת דודים
הגיע שבועתו שנשבע הקב"ה לאברהם שיגאל את בניו

»R. Maþya ben Ḥǽræš (about 130 A. D.) said: (it is written, Ezek. 16^{8}:) 'When I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy time was the time of love'. (The time of) the oath that the Holy One swore to Abraham, that He would save his children, had arrived.»

TB Taʿ^{a}nīþ 19 b כיון שהגיע זמנו: »as soon as his (appointed) time arrived».

TB Ḥullīn 92 a

הגיע זמנן של ישראל לפרות ולרבות ... הגיע זמנן של ישראל ליגאל
וכה"א ויז נצחם על בגדי וכל מלבושי אגאלתי ... הגיע זמנה של מצרים
לשתות כוס התרעלה

»Arrived Israel's time *(z^{e}man)* to be fruitful and multiply, with reference to Exod. 1_{7} . . . »Arrived Israel's time to be saved (the appointed time for Israel's salvation arrived), with reference to Isa 63_{3} (where אגאלתי is taken to allude to גאל, 'save') . . . Arrived the time of Egypt to drink the 'cup of trembling'.»

TB Taʿ^{a}nīþ 14 a

בשעת פטירתו של אדם

»in the predetermined hour of man's death».

TY K^{e}þubbōþ ii (cf. *Cant. R.* 8)

... הקב"ה יודע אימתי עונתן של צדיקים לסלקן מן העולם והוא מסלקן

»The Holy One knows when *the appointed time (ʿōnā) of the righteous to take them up from* the world has arrived, and then he takes them up.»

TY Yoma 42 c: (cf. *TB Yoma* 39 b)

ארבעים שנה שימש שמעון הצדיק את ישראל בכהונ׳ גדולה ובשנה האחרונה אמר להן בשנה הזאת אני מת אמרו לו מאיכן אתה יודע אמר להן כל שנה ושנה שהייתי נכנס לבית קודש הקדשים היה זקן אחד לבוש לבנים ועטוף לבנים נכנס עמי ויוצא עמי ובשנה הזו נכנס עמי ולא יצא עמי. בעון קומי ר׳ אבהו והכתיב וכל אדם לא יהיה באהל מועד ואפי׳ אותם שכתוב בהם ודמות פניהם פני אדם אמר לון מאן אמר לי דהוה בר נש אני אומר הקב״ה הוה

[A *Bāraiþā*] »Forty years long did Šimʿon the Righteous (about 300 B. C.) serve Israel in the office of High Priest. The last year [of his service] he said to them: 'In this year I shall die'. They said to him: 'Whence do you know?' He answered: 'Every year, at the time when I entered the Holy of Holies (*i.e.* on the day of atonement) an aged one clad in white garment and cloak entered with me and went out with me. This year he entered with me but did not go out with me'. [Here the Bāraiþā ends.] They asked R. Abbahu [to explain this]: "lo, it is written (Lev. 16^{17}) 'There shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation', not even those of whom it is written (Ezek. 1^{10}): 'the likeness of their face is the face of a man"; he said to them: 'if someone says that it was (the son of) a man, I on the contrary maintain that it was the Holy One'.»

From the passages thus quoted the following expressions may be collected, viz.

(1) *ʿōnāþō, z^{e}mannō:* his (its) time.
(2) *yėš šāʿā l^{e}:* It etc. has its (or: a) time.
(3) *yeš šāʿā li, lo,* etc.: I, have my (appointed) time.
(4) *higgi^{aʿ} z^{e}mắn:* the appointed time (has) arrived.
(5) *higgi^{aʿ} zemannī́:* my time has come.
(6) *z^{e}mān hāyā lif^{e}lonī šæ- + imperf.:* there was a time for such and such that he should.
(7) *higgi^{aʿ} z^{e}man šæ- + imperf.:* the time had arrived . . . that . . . should . . .
(8) *higgi^{aʿ} z^{e}mān (z^{e}mannō etc.) l^{e} + inf.:* the time had arrived to . . .

The constructions (7) and (8) are important as forming the exact equivalents to the ἵνα-construction of Jn 12^{23}: ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The *šæ- + imperf.* (Aramaic:

d^e + imperf.) is very naturally, almost necessarily, reproduced by a ἵνα-construction.[1]

In the preceding only such dicta have been cited that have *not* been adduced by Billerbeck to the relevant passages (viz. Jn 2 4 and 12 27). Among those quoted by Billerbeck special attention might be called to the following:

Deut. R. 2 2, with the repeated Aramaic formulas שעתא עברת, '*the appointed time has passed*'. Further the expressions 'his', 'her' or 'its', 'time': שעתו, שעתה, זמנו, זמניה, זמנה, 'your time' זמנכם (*TY Ber.* 8 d, *TB B^er.* 9 b, *TP Yom ṭoƀ* 61 c, *TP Ḥ^ag.* 78 a, *TB Šab.* 55 b, *TB Ḥ^aḡ.* 4 b).

Of *Mandæan* instances only the following deserves notice:

GR II 1 48 15—20 (*Pet* 53 17—21)

... לא מיתגאלילינין באלמא אלמא דמאטיא זיבנא ושאליב כעלא דאלמא
תוב על דנאב אלמיא אתינין על נישמאתא דשאלמאניא ועל נישמאתא
ד̄האיאביא ד̄הטון ואסכיל באלמא וביהשוכא דאיריא

(In the well-known context speaking of the appearance of the messenger, Enoš, in the different *world-ages.*) »After that (*scil.* Enoš's revelation in the time of Pilate) we do not reveal ourselves to the world, *until the time (ziƀna) arrives* and (until) the measure of the world is complete. Then, *at the ends of the worlds* (= the world-ages: Lidzbarski) we come to the spirits of the perfect ones and to the spirits of the sinners that have sinned and erred in the world and therefore dwell in the Darkness.»

From *Pistis Sophia,* the following might be cited (Horner's English translation, pp. 83, 84):

»(J speaks to the Pistis Sophia:) 'Not yet did my Father command to me, he who emanated me out, for to take away their light from them (*scil.* the inimical Rulers). But I shall seal up (σφραγίζειν) their Places (τόποι) of the Selfwilled (αὐθάδης) with all his Rulers, *these which hate thee, because thou believedst the Light.* And also I shall seal up the Places of the Adamas with his Rulers, that they should not be able to war with thee, *until their time is fulfilled,* and until cometh the season (καιρός) and commandeth to me my Father, that I should take away their light from them'. But afterwards also I said to her 'Hear and I (will) speak with thee of *their time* in which these (things) will happen, namely, these which I said to thee, they are about to happen whenever the *three times* should be fulfilled.' Answered the Pistis Sophia, said she to me, 'O Light, whereby shall I know when (will) happen the three times, that I might be glad and rejoice because *approached the time for thee to lead me unto my Place,* and also I shall rejoice because came the time (when) thou wilt take away the powers of light from all, *those who hate me,* because I believed thy light?'... 'behold, I appointed that they should not dare (to do) unto thee anything of evil, until were fulfilled the three times'... Now therefore whenever they should oppress thee *at that time,* hymn up unto the Light, and I, I shall not fail thee for to help thee... I am coming unto this Place in which I put thee, ... until I lead thee unto thy Place, this out of which thou camest.» The three times are evidently the three æons, sometimes spoken of as the three days, of the world-drama with reference to the salvation of the spiritual from its incarceration in the non-spiritual. (Cf. the Manichæan »Book of the three times».)

---

[1] Supposing a writer, used to thinking in Aramaic (or in the Jewish-Aramaic or Hebraic formulas), were to attempt to render into Greek a construction of this kind present in his mind at the time of writing; then his resort to a ἵνα-construction would not be merely a sign of deficient mastership of the Greek language; the ἵνα-construction would present itself as the only construction preserving the specific *nuance* of the Aramaic construction. The present writer finds an analogy to this in his own English rendering of the construction above, pp. 275 f. The English is certainly clumsy, but the construction with 'that ... should' was felt to preserve the specific colour of the original.

This specific nuance, viz. the *Saviour-Messenger's* appointed time, is evidently that which forms the nearest approach to the Jn-ine conception. At least, one might reproduce that conception somewhat as follows: J has a specific time of his own, and this 'time' is not on a par with appointed times extant for 'every man and every thing', but is an essential attribute of his function as Saviour, Messenger and Son.

On the other hand, the linguistic formulations and the terminology are those of the Jewish traditions. The antithesis of vs. 6 gains its particular point only from an understanding of this fact. It is then seen that the real force of the dictum is contained in the second part of that vs.: »*your* 'time' is always at hand». To the Jews it was a self-evident truth that every man had his time; they would easily acquiesce in a statement by J like that of Jn 2 4 or of 7 6 a. *Only with his abnegation of an 'appointed time' for his hearers was the startling novelty of his claim brought out.* 'Your time is always at hand' would in its deeper implication[1] to a contemporary hearer sound as an utter absurdity, and as an absurdity it is evidently intended, although to a modern ear the sense of absurdity is lost. The significance of this statement is to be apprehended in relation to the antithesis of vs. 7: »οὐ δύναται ὁ κόσμος μισεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἐμὲ δὲ μισεῖ, ὅτι ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρά ἐστιν. In what capacity do the hearers lack an 'appointed time?' The answer is: quā belonging to the '*world*'; they are of the 'world', for such is the implication of the expression: 'the world cannot hate you' (cf. above p. 225). The contrast would be simply: me the world hates because I do *not* belong to the world. This is also a common idea of the Saviour-mysticism.[1] But the antithesis is supplemented in Jn by the addition: 'because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil'. J as the possessor of the Divine μαρτυρία, testimony, is a testifyer to the evilness of the world, that is, the Divine-Spiritual in J, when clashing with the 'cosmical', reveals the 'world' as evil. The dictum is an expression of the same spiritual phenomenon as that spoken of 3^{18-19}.

---

[1] It should be remembered that this 'deeper implication' would be the natural one, at once understood by a contemporary hearer.

One might have expected that J's appointed time would be defined as the time of his appearance in the world. Speaking simply from the premises of the Saviour-mysticism this would have been quite natural: the descent of the Saviour to the world belongs to his 'time' as much as his ascent. But the Jn-ine terminology goes a step farther. J's time is not to be defined only as the time appointed for his activity as Saviour, but as the time for the consummation (πεπλήρωται 7^{8}) of that activity, *viz.* his final ascent, *i.e.* his return to his Father.

The result is: there exists an internal connexion between 7^{6} and 77. The antithesis contains on one side: the appointed time of J, which is a spiritual time, viz. the consummation in the realm of the Father of the work of salvation performed on earth in relation to the world, on the other side: the timeless-ness of the terrestrial world, centering in its hatred against the spiritual. *The world has severed itself from the time-order instituted by the Divine will,* and now it has its own time, which is always at hand. In spite of this severance, however, the time of J has also its effects upon the world, vide on 3^{16-21}.

The question remains: does not the inclusiveness of the Son of Man apply to the present idea? The answer is easily found: just as the believers, those who have opened themselves to the spiritual reality, are included with J in the antithesis to the κόσμος — Jn $15^{18, 19}$! — so also they are included in his 'time'. Not that the time of J's glorification, as an 'external' point of time, meant the simultaneous consummation for the believers, but their entrance into the spiritual realm implies that they, through J, partake of the Divine time-order: there is also for them a 'final ascent', connected with the experience of the ἀνάβασις of J. This is confirmed by a comparison of $3^{14\text{f.}}$, 6^{44} and 12^{32}. (*Vide* above p. 99 l. 32—p. 100 l. 7.)

---

[1] Cf. Bultmann, *Die Bedeutung der neuerschl. mand. und manich. Quellen*, pp. 123—126.

7^{8} ὑμεῖς ἀνάβητε εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν. ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην, ὅτι ὁ ἐμὸς καιρὸς οὔπω πεπλήρωται. The antithesis between ὑμεῖς ἀνάβητε and ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω postulates the allusion to a spiritual antithesis. This is evidently contained in the latter part: I do not make my ἀνάβασις, 'final, spiritual ascent', at this festival occasion. (Bauer, *ad loc.*)

$7^{15\text{f.}}$ ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὴ ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με. ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς πότερον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν ἢ ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ λαλῶ. This forms the natural counterpart to the statements concerning the 'self-testimony'. J gives a *doctrine,* a teaching, but this is not his own; it is not a teaching proceeding from his earthly, external study of the scriptures, reached by deduction and exegesis. For so the hearers are represented as taking it. They acknowledge that he is a 'teacher', but in contrast to the teachers in general, he does not present himself as the disciple of a teacher: μὴ μεμαθηκώς, אין תלמיד. That the allusion when speaking of the διδαχή, is to the Scriptures, not to a doctrine in general in the philosophical, or Hellenistic sense, is evidenced by the immediate reference to the *Torā*: 7^{19}. The general nexus of ideas, hence, is even in this respect the same as in 5^{30-47}. J opposes the hearers' study of and teaching on the basis of the Tora. While they profess to teach only what has been handed over from Moses (תורת משה מסני *Sanh.* pb etc.) and to be the disciples of Moses (cf. Jn 9^{28}), they do not observe the Tōrā, since their attitude towards it is an external one. J again, seemingly independent, speaks only out of his unity with the real originator of the Tōrā, the Father. He is not a יודע מעצמו[1] in the Rabbinic sense of the words, but a διδακτός θεοῦ (6^{45}) in the prophetic sense. Similarly, the real discipleship of J is not the external one, but that which proceeds from a will to do the will of the Father. And this has to be explained from the conception of the performance of the Divine works of ch. 6.

---

[1] *M. Ḥag̅.* 2 1, *TB Kepubb.* 111 a (Joseph was a *yōdeaᶜ mēᶜaṣmō* in his capacity of perfect righteous).

The contrast between J and the hearers is concentrated in the statement of $7^{28,29}$ 'Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am: and I am not come of myself but he that sent me is true whom ye know not' followed by $7^{33,34}$: 'Yet a little while am I with you and then I go unto him that sent me. Ye shall seek me and shall not find me: and where I am, thither ye cannot come'. The hearers falsely maintain that they know J; *their* knowledge of him is of the same kind as their knowledge of the Scriptures = it is merely external. His spiritual οὐσία they do not know, nor do they know the Scriptures, or God of whom these speak. The spiritual reality is closed to them: they cannot enter that world where J is at home and where he will be exclusively abiding when his external appearance has passed from their vision. To the same fact refers vs. 24: μὴ κρίνετε κατ᾽ ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε. The hearers' judgement is based upon an external vision, they judge according to the flesh, κατὰ τὴν σάρκα (8^{15}). They are, however, here admonished to 'judge righteous judgement'. This presupposes, evidently, that the hearers' true destination is to know the spiritual world and do the Divine works. It is, also, significant that the hearers addressed are in vs. 24 evidently the ὄχλος, the mass, not the Pharisees. In the case of the ὄχλος there was a possibility of an attainment to the spiritual light. In the case of the Pharisees, as in 8^{15}, the externality of judgement is pronounced simply as an unalterable fact.

The contrast between external and spiritual knowledge is further brought out in a manner that would be especially striking to a Rabbinic hearer, viz. through the reference in vss. 26 b, 27 to the idea that the Messiah would be unknown before his appearance as Messiah. The Rabbinic and pre-Rabbinic speculations on this point are admirably resumed by Billerbeck (vol. ii, p. 488 f.).[1]

---

[1] Notice esp. *ib.*: »Die Worte (Jn 7^{27}) sind nicht so zu verstehen, als ob vom Messias niemand wisse, von wem er abstammen, oder wo er werde geboren werden; denn daran, dass der messianische König ein Davidide sein werde, bestand seit Ps Sal $17,_{21}$, also etwa seit der Mitte des letzten vorchristl. Jahrh.s kein Zweifel mehr; u. ebensowenig war unbekannt, dass Bethlehem als sein mutmasslicher Geburtsort anzusehen sei ... Vielmehr liegt den Worten Joh $7,_{27}$ die Vorstellung zugrunde, dass der Messias vor seinem öffentlichen Hervortreten unerkannt irgendwo in der Verborgenheit weilen werde, so dass vorher niemand wissen könne, wer für das messianische Amt berufen sei, u. woher der Betreffende plötzlich kommen werde. Von Jesus aber wisse man, dass er aus

These speculations, says J, are merely external, and, by the hearers, externally applied. From the external point of view, it is true, J is not unknown nor, after being unknown, suddenly revealed, and, externally, proclaimed as Messiah. But the Rabbinic dictum might yet be said to contain a truth, if it were spiritually interpreted: for spiritually J really is unknown to the hearers, he comes from one whom they do not know. But this one is not an external, terrestrial being; on the contrary he is *a 'truthful one'*, one of the world of truth, *i.e.* of the spiritual world.[1] ἀλήθεια and δίκη are the characteristic terms of the spiritual world in the present section: vs. 18.

To 7^{34} one might compare the Mandæan passages *GR* 259, 260, also 256^{3} and 268^{4}.

בכול אתר ד̄אנא אתון אשכחיתון עלי ד̄בכול אתר אנא איתי

(The Messenger confirms to his hearers, the believers, that they will always find him.) This is really in accordance with the Jn-ine idea: the believers are included, or destined to be included in the return of J to his spiritual abode. This is affirmed Jn, $14^{4,5}$.

7^{37}: Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔκραξεν λέγων ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ πινέτω. The expression ἔκραξεν has probably a deeper meaning: it refers to the Voice of Son of Man, spoken of above on 5^{19-29}. He voices a call[2] to the world, inviting men to come to him and obtain the water of life, referred to in ch. 4.

Nazareth sei, darum könne sein Auftreten mit dem des Messias nichts zu schaffen haben». Billerbeck refers to Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph* 8, 110, *4 Ezra* 13^{52} and the frequent Rabbinic expressions »Messiah will be *revealed*», »Messiah *appears*» נגלה *Res. R* 36, 37, *Pesiq* 149 a, cf. *TB Beraḵ* 5 a, *Midr Rup* 1_2, »Messiah is hidden» etc. נחבא, נתעכב (*M. Ps.* 21, *Pesiq. R.* 34).

[1] It is difficult to follow Wetter when he maintains (*Sohn Gottes*, p. 97) that the Evangelist is *at a loss* how to answer the objection concerning J's known origin. The fact is on the contrary, that such an objection forms an excellent illustration for the 'Evangelist's' aim of showing the otherness of the spiritual world and J's adherence to that world.

[2] For the expression εἱστήκει ... καὶ ἔκραξεν one might point to Rabbinic, Mandæan and Samaritan parallels:

(1) *Rabbinic: Meḵ* (14^{22}) 31 a (Mišpaṭim par. 8) *ExodR.* 29_7 (Schlatter).
(2) *Mandæan: GR.* 97, 117, 125, 189, 208, *GL.* 65, 107.
(3) *Samaritan:* כרז בקל רם, קעם וכרז *Asfar Ieliata* 18 b, 19 a, 35 b.

Billerbeck[1] and Vacher Burch[2] reaffirm the allusion in 7^{37}, somewhat disregarded of late, to the libation of water at the Sukkoþ-festival and to the ideas connected therewith. If J, as is probable, here refers to the libation of water, he means to says to his hearers: 'you consider that you have in the libation of water a symbol of the drawing of the water of salvation of which the prophets (Isa 12^{3}) prophesied; know then, than the prophetic promise is fulfilled now and here, in me (thus Billerbeck)'. The allusion to this Jewish custom is parallel to the allusion to Samaritan ideas of the living water, and like the latter (ch. 4) it aims at the usual transference of the attention from the external to the Divine-spiritual. This is also the object of the startling sequel: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ξῶντος. It seems unnecessary to assume a mistranslation here, as Burney does.[3] The utterance fits in perfectly with the Jn-ine doctrine of the Spiritual Water as the generating efflux. The Water given from above through the Son becomes the receiver's possession; he partakes of the 'life in one self' characteristic of the spiritual world (4^{14}); of this the present is the necessary and naturally sequence: he partakes also of the Divine generation of Life in the spiritual world. ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ naturally refers to the spiritual organism of the spiritually born. Out of the spiritually born the spiritual generating efflux will proceed as it does from the Father and from the Son: the spiritually born will generate in the spiritual world.[4]

The reference to the 'Scripture' (καθώς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή) is remarkable. The attempts made at finding the passage quoted, in the Scriptures known to us must be said to have been unsuccessful. Of the two remaining possibilities (a) that J quotes 'freely mixing together several passages', and (b) that the quotation is from a lost writing, hence apocryphal, the latter is that which, further demonstration lacking, appears as less forced. Bauer's construction, referring αὐτοῦ to the Saviour, supposed subject of the quotation, is allowable only (— also on Bauer's own premises —) on the assumption that the present wording is unintelligible. Hence, with the interpretation here afforded, this construction — or reconstruction — need not be considered. His observation that κοιλία connotes the organism mainly with respect to its functions of generation and nutrition[1] is to be noted. This applies also or even more to the Hebrew equivalent, מעים, Aramaic מעין. Hence Billerbeck's assumption[2] that κοιλία is to be interpreted in analogy with the Hebrew גוף (originally 'cavity') as 'person', or as substitute for the personal pronoun, is perhaps to be rejected.[3]

---

[1] vol. ii, pp. 490—492.

[2] *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 80 ff.

[3] *Ar. Or. 4 Gosp.*, p. 110.

[4] Cf. *GenR.* 4.

The very idea of the believer's generative function in the spiritual world has as its counterpart the Rabbinic conception of the disciple as himself by possessing the water (= the teaching) becoming a teacher who in his turn calls forth disciples-teachers.[4] Just as J against the Jewish conception of the water as doctrine, teaching, Tōrā, puts the spiritual, realistic, idea of the water as life itself so he puts against the said Jewish conception of the overflowing of the water as the continuous tradition from teacher to teacher, the spiritual, realistic, idea of the generation of spiritual life from the side of spiritual beings.

---

[1] *J. Ev.*^{2} p. 110.

[2] vol. ii, p. 492.

[3] Cf. V. Burch, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 83 ff.

[4] *Sifre* Deut 11^{22} »When the disciple is like the well, then just as the well flows out living water on all sides so from that disciple there will come forth disciples and their disciples» (quoted by Billerbeck, vol. ii, p. 493). For parallels in Philonic writings cf. Grill, *Unters.*, pp. 16, 127.

8^{12} ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν μοι οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ᾽ ἕξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς. The Spiritual World is Light. He who follows J, does not need to walk in the world of darkness, but enters the spiritual world, receives the spiritual reality, the life. J's self-identification with the Light is parallel with his self-identification with the Celestial Bread. He is the Spiritual World come down to the *world* of Darkness, illuminating it. The vs. retrospects on 3^{19-21}. ὁ ἀκολουθῶν μοι must be taken in its spiritual sense, *i.e.* as an expression parallel with 'eating the bread of Life', 'drinking the water of Life', 'believing in the lifted-up Son of Man'. It implies following J *into* the Divine-spiritual world. Cf. 12^{26}.

The *self*-predication »I am the Light of the World» could, from a Rabbinic standpoint, be uttered only by the Holy One Himself or possibly by the Tōrā. The epithet 'the Light of the World' or 'the Lamp (λύχνος) of the World' might, however, otherwise be applied besides (1) to God, *NumR* 15_4 (אורו של עולם), *Tanḥ* ii 61 b (נרו של עולם), (2) to the first man, Adam, *TY Šab.* 5 b, (3) to prominent saints or teachers, as R. Yoḥanān ben Zakkai *'Āƀ. R. Nāþān* 25, (4) to the Tōrā, *TB Baƀ. Bāþ.* 4 a, (5) to Israel *CantR* 1_{21} (ישראל אורה לעולם), *CantR* 1_{65} (את מביאה אורה לעולם, of Israel), (6) to Jerusalem *GenR* 59_8 (ירושלים אורו של עולם . . . ומי הוא אורה של ירושלם הקב"ה). *Vide* Billerbeck i 237[1] Particularly mystical significance adheres to (2), Adām as the light of the world. In him the Divine-spiritual was brought down into the world (cf. further below).

For the terminology of 8^{12} one might further compare *TB Keþubb.* 111 a המשתמש באור תורה אור תורה מחייהו »he who makes use of the light of the Torā, him the light of the Torā will make living», and the conception of the *nešāmā* (spirit), being of Divine origin, as the light in man: *Pesiq* 145 a, *TB Šab* 30 ab (cf. Jn $12^{35, 36}$).

In Jewish Mystical literature it is quite natural that the little Yhuh, Meṭaṭron, should be able to utter the self-predicative: 'I am the Light of the World', for by this he merely states that he has received authority from the Holy One, and fulfills his functions with regard to the world. He carries the light of the Holy One, which light pervades the whole world. (Cf. *3 En* 10^{1}, $12^{1,3}$.). The self-predication in general (»I am ...») is also characteristic of the Jewishmystical presentations of Meṭaṭron in *3 En* 3—15.

---

[1] To the quotations given by Billerbeck *loc. cit.* one might add also *NumR* 14

אתה הוא אורו של עולם והאורה דרה אצלך

»Thou (God) art the Light of the World and the Light dwells with thee.»

Bultmann (in *Die Bed. d. neuerschl. mand. u. manich. Quellen* etc., pp. 110 f.) has collected a number of Mandæan passages under the caption »the Messenger leads from the darkness into the Light». It might, indeed, be considered unnecessary to give special references in this respect, since the whole Mand. lit. teems with such general passages referring to the 'Light' of the spiritual world. The particular expression relevant here, viz. »*I am* the Light of the World», is, however, not to be found. This is strange, since the idea in question is certainly extant. The Messenger comes from the Light, he is a Son of the Light, he speaks of himself (frequently) as a bringer of Light to the world of Darkness; the (faithful) spirits themselves are of the Light, love the Light when it comes to them, clothe themselves in Light, and ascend through the Messenger to the House of Light etc. etc. To the passages quoted by Bultmann (and secondarily by Bauer, *ad. loc.*) the following may be added:

GR V 2 179^{22-27} (*Pet* 175^{7-12})

האזין הו נהורא דהייא ד̄עתיגל̇יא ושאבויא בהיריא זידקא ואמארלהון
מאנ̇דא ד̄הייא עתית ל̇מישכאן ל̇ואתאיכון ויאקמינכון בנהורא ד̄הייא
ואפרישתינכון מן אמאמיא ודאריא ועיאקמינכון בראהמות כושטא ותיהון
כשיטיא קודאמאי בנהורא דהייא

»This (one) *is the Light of the Life,* which was revealed, and the men of provèd faith praised it. And Manda dHayye said to them: 'I am come in order to dwell with you and I shall establish you in the *Light of the Life* (cf. τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς). I have separated you from the nations and the generations, I will establish you in the *Love of the Truth (Kušṭa)* and you shall be *truthful ones* (*i.e.* citizens of the world of Truth, cf. ἀληθινός of Jn 7^{28}) before me in the *Light of the Life.*» Cf. the quotations given below on Jn $12^{35\text{ f.}}$

For the general conceptions of the Deity and the Saviour-Messenger as Light it may suffice to refer to G. P. Wetter[1] and Bauer.[2]

---

[1] ΦΩΣ 1915 and »*Ich bin das Licht der Welt*» in *Beiträge zur Religionswissenschaft* I 2, pp. 166—201, 1914.

[2] *J. Ev.*^{2}, pp. 115—117.

It is then specially to be noted that both Wetter and Bauer expressly recognize the Oriental, »non-Hellenic», provenance of the ideas and formulas in question. Acc. to Wetter they go back ultimately to Babylonian religion (astrological conceptions, the heavenly Lights, the Fire of heaven etc.). Bauer again, for Jn 8^{12}, connects the ideas principally with the »Gnosis in its widest sense». Typical, however, for Bauer's exegesis is, that he, founding merely on *two* passages, viz. *Corp. Herm.* I 6 and a dictum by Alexandros from Abonuteichos laid in the mouth of his God Γλύκων finds reason to maintain: »there seems to have been *a fixed formula*(!) by which the Deity introduced itself: I am the light».[1] The superficiality of this statement is even more apparent, when one compares it with Bauer's total omission of mentioning the numerous Jewish references to the Deity as Light. Bauer might as well to his scanty references have added the following passage from the *Bāškalamantropanišad* 23, where Indra, the »God our Father» speaks of himself: »*I am light and immortality, I am the bond [of the world], what has been, is being, and will be born*». Quite inadmissible, however, is Bauer's careless identification of the Jn-ine φῶς τοῦ κόσμου with the φῶς τῆς γνώσεως. No attempt is made to analyse the specific bearing of the Jn-ine dictum of 8^{12}.

With a much more scholarly grasp upon the problem Büchsel treats of the Jn-ine conception of the Light[3], hence also of Jn 8^{12}. He analyses the Jn-ine conception and then puts it in relation on one hand to Jewish on the other to supposed Hellenistic parallels. »The Light is metaphysical Reality» (what we have here termed 'spiritual reality'). It is the »Good» as contained in the Divine οὐσία revealed to the world. J's self-predication as the Light of the World corresponds to the Jewish designation of God as the Light of the World. The 'I'-formula is already to be found in the

---

[1] *op. cit.*, p. 116. The object is to convey that Jn belongs to circles that used such a formula. Bauer's real interest with this statement is to demonstrate that Jn is un-Jewish, and belongs in a West-Hellenistic environment. He forgets that he has just declared that the ideas are un-Hellenic and specifically Oriental. That he has previously quoted Mandæan (by Hellenistic thought and religious ideas quite uninfluenced) passages need not cause astonishment, since the Mandæan quotations have been inserted at random *after* the completion of the rest of the work.

[2] S. K. Belvalkar, *Four Unpublished Upaniṣadic Texts* etc., Madras 1925. The Upanišad contains several passages that might be quoted as parallels to the Jn-ine expressions.

[3] *Joh. und d. hell. Synkret.*, pp. 66—68.

O.T. There is no ground for the derivation either of the one or the other from the Hellenistic Gnosis. The parallels in Philos writings correspond exactly with the Jewish traditions whereas the related conceptions in Philo founding upon Greek thought are missing in Jn.[1]

In general Büchsel's observations hold true. There is, however, one distinction to be made. It is certainly correct to say that there is nowhere so close a parallel to Jn 8[12] in linguistic expression as in Jewish (Rabbinic) sources. But it should also be noted that the expression 'the Light of the world' carries another significance than it, *usually,* does in Rabbinic contexts. The difference might perhaps but be characterized thus: the Rabbinic use is merely symbolical corresponding fairly with the idea evolved by the phrase in question in the mind of a present-day reader: God is the Light of the World because He enlightens men's minds and hearts concerning Goodness and Truth, and so on. The same might be said of the Torā. In particular, it comes an *ethical* aspect. The 'Light of the World' illumines man's way by showing him what is right and good. It might, however, be presumed that this exclusively symbolical sense is not the original or only sense so far as Rabbinism is concerned. Just as the word 'Light' (especially in the form אורה, as distinguished from אור) in certain contexts clearly conveys the conception of a Celestial radiance, to be perceived as an actual light by celestial beings, or by terrestrial beings possessing the Celestial within themselves (the Great or Divine *Nešāmā*), so the phrase 'the Light of the World' might be expected to have been used in a similar 'literal' sense. It will be maintained that at least a trace of such a 'literal' sense may be found in the passage *TY Šab.* 5 b speaking of Adam as the Light or Lamp of the World.

---

[1] Büchsel, *op. cit.*, p. 68, not 9: »Wenn man philonische Worte über das Licht zum Vergleich heranzieht, spürt man, dass dieselbe Grundlage auf beiden Seiten vorliegt. Auch für Philon ist das Licht das Gute, das sich dem Menschen offenbart. Aber bei Philon ist dieser Grundgedanke mit den begrifflichen Mitteln griechischen Denkens vorgetragen. Diese fehlen bei Joh. Z. B. wenn Philon von Gott als Licht redet, nennt er ihn die intelligible Sonne, vor der das Dunkel der Leidenschaften und Schlechtigkeiten zerstiebt, dass die reinste und liebenswerteste Erscheinung der strahlenden Tugend erscheint (*humanit.* § 164). Oder er redet vom Auge des Seienden, das fremden Lichtes nicht bedarf, selbst aber als urbildlicher Glanz strahlen aussendet, die nicht sinnlich, sondern intelligibel sind (*cherubim* § 97, ähnlich *somn.* I § 75). Den Gegensatz von νοητός und αἰσθητός, die Tugenden, die Leidenschaften, das Seiende findet man bei Joh. nicht.»

אדם הראשון דמו של עולם דכתיב ואיד יעלה מן הארץ וגרמה לו חוה מיתה . . . אדם הראשון חלה טהורה לעולם היה. דכתיב וייצר אלהים את האדם עפר מן האדמה . . . וגרמה לו חוה מיתה . . . אדם הראשון נרו של עולם היה שנ׳ נר אלהים נשמת אדם

»The First Man was the Blood of the World, as it is written (Gen. 2 6) 'and there went up a mist from the earth etc.' and Eve brought Death upon him ... The First Man was a pure dough for the world, as it is written (Gen. 2 9) 'and the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground' ... and Eve brought death upon him ... the First Man was the Light of the World, as it is written (Prov. 20 27) 'Adam's spirit *(nᵉšāmā)* was a lamp of God'. And Eve brought death upon him.» — The original significance of the whole of this passage (as here reproduced) is clearly mystical. The First Man, to his *Nᵉšāmā,* was an essence of the Deity, a spark of the Divine Light, shining in the world'. The statement concerning Eve's function in bringing death upon the First Man is specially suggestive. The implication is: through the sin of the first pair the Celestial Reality thithertofore dwelling in man, was removed from him. The connexion with the conception of the Light of the First Man, removed with his sin, but preserved in heaven for the righteous, is obvious. This Light was clearly no mere symbolical expression, but a substantial reality. The *Splendour of the Šᵉk̄inā* has the same character of substantiality.[1]

It would now seem to be a highly important fact that the Jn-ine conception of the 'Light' and of J as the 'Light of the World' has the following two aspects, viz.

(1) it relates to the ethical side of the spiritual Life as revealed to mankind (cf. above on 3 16—21, p. 146 (9)); this is the particularly Rabbinic use of the term 'Light',

(2) it refers to a spiritual, substantial reality. J is the Light of the World in the same way as he is the Bread from Heaven,

---

[1] Cf. Odeberg, *3 Enoch,* Transl., p. 15, note (4). In the preserved setting of *3 En.* the presence of the *Šᵉk̄inā* with its splendour *(ziu̯)* is connected with the presence of *Enoch Meṭaṭron,* the little Yhu̯h, on earth. The removal ('lifting up') of this carrier of the light of the Šᵉk̄īnā from earth to heaven is identified with the removal of the light of the Šᵉk̄īnā itself. (*3 En* 6 1 compared with 5 1—14.) The background is: the *Light* (or Splendour), which '*shines through the whole world* (*3 En* 5 4)' is really = the little Yhu̯h, who has descended in Adam as Adam Qadmon the Protanthropos, in Enoch, and subsequently in Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Elijah (the lists of incarnations vary). The Light is a spiritual substance, also a sustaining substance, a spiritual food, *n.b.* for the members of the celestial world, the shorers in celestial existence.

namely as comprising in Himself the Spiritual Reality. The Light of Life, φῶς τῆς ζωῆς, is the Spiritual Life itself in its Divine, substantial Reality.

In this latter respect it should be maintained, that Büchsel's[1] rejection of Wetter's thesis that the Light was conceived in a material sense, might be misleading. The best expression, it may be urged, of the actual import of the conception of the Divine Light and of J as identical with that Divine Light, will be found by applying it to Lindblom's characterization of the Jn-ine conception of the Eternal Life as comprising on one hand the religious and ethical character and on the other hand the metaphysical-physical Divine substance of immortality.[2] That the characterizations of the Light apply to that of the Life is evident already from the general rule of the all-inclusiveness of the spiritual world. Of this significantly Bernard: »The phrase τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς may mean the Light which imparts life or illuminates life; or it may mean the Light which issues from Life . . . When we apply such concepts as ζωή, φῶς, to God or to Christ, we cannot treat them as if we knew them to be fundamentally distinct. They are qualities or aspects of Absolute Being, and it is beyond our powers to define them adequately or explain their mutual relation. In the Fourth Gospel, Christ is the Light: He is also the Life (11^{25}, 14^{1}).

---

[1] *op. cit.* p. 66: »Dass es als metaphysische Wirklichkeit stofflich gedacht wäre, ist aber nicht gesagt.»

[2] Lindblom, *Das ewige Leben,* pp. 236 ff. It might be allowed to quote here Lindblom's summary in full:

»Die Hauptzüge des religiösen Lebensideals johanneischen Typus sind also:

1) Das ideale Leben ist göttliches Leben, das in erster Linie von den göttlichen Personen, Gott und dem Sohn Gottes als Logos und Christus, besessen wird, und das vor seiner Offenbarung in der Menschenwelt eine Existenz hat, die von aller menschlichen Geschichte unabhängig ist.

2) Das letzte Ziel des Liebeswillens Gottes ist, die Menschen dieses göttlichen Lebens teilhaftig zu machen. Die Hindernisse dafür werden durch das objektive Erlösungswerk Christi aus dem Wege geräumt.

3) Der Mensch erlangt das göttliche Leben dadurch, dass er durch Vertiefung in die Glaubensgnosis und den Vollzug der Taufe die Wiedergeburt erlebt, wodurch er göttliches Wesen anzieht, ein Kind Gottes in supranaturalem Sinne wird.

4) Das durch die Wiedergeburt gewonnene göttliche Wesen umfasst einerseits den *religiösen und sittlichen Charakter* des *Christen in* allen seinen *Auswirkungen,* andrerseits aber auch *die metaphysisch-physische göttliche Unsterblichkeitssubstanz.* Diese göttliche Unsterblichkeitssubstanz als reale, konkrete Kraft ist der spezifische Inhalt des Begriffs des idealen »Lebens» in den johanneischen Schriften »

Perhaps Light *is* Life, in its essence; perhaps Life, truly understood, is Light.»[1]

8^{14-19} the self-testimony. The thoughts of 5^{30-47} recur here. The formal contradiction (Bernard) between 8^{14} and 5^{31} is probably intentional. It is another instance of the method of impressing the other-ness of the spiritual world by startling utterances. With the interpretation given above it is evident that, spiritually seen, there is no contradiction. A self-testimony is false, taken in the terrestrial sense of testimony of oneself as a separate entity; in the spiritual world the self-testimony is the testimony of the Father in the Son. For the expression 8^{17} »in *your* Law» (בתורתכם) cf. Lagrange.[2] The expression is an allusion to the frequent Rabbinic (*i.e.* Pharisaic) בתורתינו, תורתינו (our Tora, in our Tora). It is strange that no modern commentator has hitherto suggested an explanation, which to the present writer seems to be very near at hand. It is indefensible to take into account only *one* the following facts, *viz.* (1) that J doubtlessly speaks of the Tora as containing spiritual words, as belonging to the Spiritual World, hence cannot possibly reject it, (2) that he never says 'our Tora', but several times 'your Torā'. The explanation seems to be: J declares himself expressly, in both contexts (5^{30-47} and here, in both passages referring to the Holy Writ) to be a Celestial Being, the Son of his Father. *God* never says 'our Law' but either 'my Law' or 'your Law'. *J stands in the same relation to the Tora as his Father.* The Tora is secondary to J, and, this was especially the case with the Tora as *manifested, in writing and tradition, to the Jews.*[3] J's position in regard to the Tora is similar to his position in regard to Abraham, or Moses. He certainly does not reject Abraham or Moses — they belong to the spiritual world — but: »before Abraham I am!» If this interpretation be true, the phrase »your Tōrā» carries the supplementary significance: »The Tora such as it presents itself to you in your external study of and speculation upon it». With this coincides that the 'quotation' of Deut 19^{15} supposed to be intended by 8^{17} is only 'a vague reference'. It does not reproduce either the

---

[1] Bernard, *ICC*, *Gospel acc. to St. John*, p. 293.

[2] *Évangile selon Saint Jean*, p. 234: »L'argument étant *ad hominem* Jésus dit «votre» loi, mais puisqu'il se préoccupe de lui donner satisfaction, il n'en rejette donc pas l'autorité. Cependant si désormais il dit votre loi (x, 34) ce n'est pas sans ironie, parce que les Pharisiens affectent d'en faire leur chose.»

[3] It is well-known that even the Pharisees-Rabbins had the concept of an eternal, pre-existent Tora and a manifested Tōrā, *cf. GenR.*

LXX or the Hebrew original.[1] It is rather a free formulation of a legalistic rule, such as the Pharisees would establish, a rule that would, however, rightly be maintained to be 'written in the Torā'.

The expression (7[16]) κρίσις . . . ἀληθινή is specifically Jewish: דין אמת. It is impossible to refute Schlatter's comment: »the connexion between the concepts of Truth and Judgement דין and קשוט = אמת, was stable with the Palestinians».[2] For J 'not judging and yet judging' and the different shades of meaning attaching to דין (κρίσις) *vide* above pp. 145 and 196 ff. — The theme of the section revolves on the conception of the utter contrast between J's world and the world of his hearers 8[14, 19].

The same contrast is repeatedly brought to the fore in the following section 8[21—29]. The hearers cannot enter his world, they are from below (ἐκ τῶν κάτω). But this fact, that they are from below, is the result of an act of their will: it is a sin. Because they have so identified themselves with the world below 'this world' that they are unable to enter the Divine world, they will 'die in their sins'.

The synonymical expressions here used for the contrast between the spiritual and the terrestrial are all specifically Jewish. 'ἐκ τῶν κάτω — ἐκ τῶν ἄνω correspond to the Hebrew משלמטה and משלמעלה (Aramaic: מדלרע and מדלעיל[א]). Related are the expressions: העליונים, 'the upper ones' = 'the celestial', and התחתונים, 'those below' = 'the terrestrials', בריות שלמעלן, the Beings above, בריות של מטן the Beings below, etc.

That ὁ κόσμος οὗτος corresponds both in expression and meaning to the Jewish העולם הזה (Hebrew), עלמא [ה]דין (Aramaic) needs no special demonstration. It can no longer be maintained that the

---

[1] Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 118.

[2] *S. u. H. 4 Ev.*, p. 94. Cf. *Mek* 22 c in a fuller form:

מלמד שכל מי שמוציא דין אמת לאמתו מעלה עליו הכתוב כאלו היה שותף
עם הקב"ה במעשה בראשית

»The Scripture-passage (*Ex.* 18[18]) teaches that every one who brings out a true judgement according to its truth the scripture reckons it to him as if had been a sharer in God's work at the Creation.»

Cf. with this the quotation from *TB Sanh* 7 a given by Billerbeck, ii 522.

Cf. further *ExR.* 6 1

מי הוא שיהיה רשאי להרהר אחר מרותיו וגזירותיו של ממ"ה הקב"ה דברים
אשר הם הצובים מלפניו שכל דבר ודבר שיוצא מלפניו טרם הוא נמלך
בפמליא של מעלה ומודיע להם הדבר כדי שידעו ויעידו כולן כי דיני דין אמת
וגזירותיו אמת וכל דבריו בהשכל (that his judgement is a true judgement)

Jewish expressions referred exclusively to the conception of the present age, the present world in contradistinction to the coming world. All depends in this respect upon the contexts. It is only natural that the vertical and horizontal conceptions intermingle. They do so also in Jn. (Cf. above on 5 19—29.) Suggestive linguistically in the phrase בעלמא הדין, 'in this world', with a locative ב (uncally) instead of the temporal ל. Still more remarkable is that the expression עלמא דאתי, the world *to come*, is actually — and frequently — found to be used where the context necessitates the sense: 'the Celestial world' (in the present[1]) = עלמא ההוא (that world), the 'World of the Spirits'. (*M Pē'ā* 4 18, *GenR* 82 9 [לחמר של עולם הבא], *Mek* 19 c and 22 b, where the spiritual world, called עולם הבא, is expressly distinguished from the 'new world', עולם חדש[2] *TB Taʿan* 11 a etc. etc.) For the expression ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε (8 21, cf. 8 24) the Rabbinic conception of this world as the world of the 'evil inclination of sins and of death' should be seen as a background.[3] For Mandæan parallels it will suffice to point to the passages cited above pp. 132—134. For the contrast between the Messenger and 'this world', cf. *GR X* 245 32—36 (*Pet* 245 8—12)

הא לריש אתית הון רישא תום עתית הא [שומאיהון] לבהיריא זידקא
וקאימיא שיביאהיא דאנדומיא דמדאנדמיא תום ראזא כאבשיא על בר
זיואי דאסגיא לכא דזיוה לאהוא מן האכא ולאהוא נהורה מן אלמא האזין

»Lo, *in the beginning*[4] I did come, and then I did come as the head to the men of proved faith. And the Seven Ones (the Planets) stand wispering against me and then they make a secret plot against the *Son of Splendours* who has come hither, whose Splendom is not from here and *whose Light is not of this world.*» (Cf. *GR XI* 258 12 f.).

8 24. The death in the sins of this world, caused by the hearers' self-identification with and self-merging into this world is connected with the failure to believe ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. On the mystical meaning of the expression ἐγώ εἰμι (אני הוא) cf. below on 8 58. τὴν ἀρχήν ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν 8 25, since obviously connected with the preceding ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι and prefocussing 8 58 πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγώ εἰμι,

---

[1] On this vide Billerbeck, iv 819, 820. Billerbeck dates the beginning of this use at about A. D. 50.

[2] The passage is very old: witness the use of the Divine name מקום.

[3] Exhaustive collection of references by Billerbeck, iv pp. 847, 848, 852.

[4] Cf. Jn 8 25, 58.

must refer to J's pre-existent being: »from the beginning I am what I speak to you».[1]

One might essay an Aramaic: *(min) šērūp̄ā mā d^{e}āmarnā l^{e}k̄ōn.*[2]

8^{28}. If, as is usual, ὅταν ὑψώσητε, is taken as referring primarily to J's elevation on the Cross, *per se,* it must be admitted, that the dictum is incomprehensible, especially if, as also is usual, the utterance is maintained to proceed from the Evangelist, not from the historical J. To be sure some exegetes have seen here an expression of the experience of the Church; only with J's death and resurrection His power became visible. But then it must be remarked that the words in question are addressed to the Jews, *i.e.* according to these exegetes, to the representatives of the Synagogue (in spite of vs. 30). And it was certainly not the experience of the Church, that the Synagogue recognized J after his elevation on the Cross.[3] The solution, it might be urged, is to be sought in a line with the interpretation of $3^{14\,\mathrm{f.}}$ put forth above: ὅταν ὑψώσητε does not refer merely to the external fact of J's elevation on the Cross but instead *primarily* to the believer's experience of J's elevation.[4] »When you shall have lifted up the son of man in your spiritual vision, then you will know, that ἐγώ εἰμι, and that I do nothing of myself but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things ...» Naturally the believer will know this, since he will then have himself entered the spiritual world.» The utterance is a parallel to 7^{17}. Secondarily, of course, the passage refers to the elevation on the Cross (J's 'hour', 'appointed time') as the fulfilment of his work, but this also only in relation to the believer's experience.[5] For Mandæan parallels to 8^{29}, cf. above pp. 41 f.

---

[1] Bauer, *J. Ev.*^{2}, p. 119. Bernard (ICC, 302): »Primarily, I am what I am telling you», Lagarde (*Évangile selon St. Jean*, p. 237 ff.): »Faut il même seulement que je vous parle?» Similarly Tillman: »Was rede ich überhaupt noch zu euch?» Delafosse, *Le quatrième évangile,* p. 170: »je suis d'abord ce que je vous dis».

[2] Cf. *e.g.* Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*^{2}, p. 84. Bauer, *J. Ev.*^{2}, pp. 119 f.

[3] Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr.*, p. 1043), who maintains that the best interpretation is: »*illud quod à principio dico vobis*» calls attention to the Rabbinic terms סיפא — רישא, by which are expressed the primary and secondary objects of consideration, *e.g.* in dicta of h^{a}lāk̄ā. This terminology, however, does not lend itself to application here.

[4] Cf. above pp. 99 f., 111—113.

[5] It follows that the passage has no bearing on the attitude of the Synagogue or the Church's experience (viz. of certain external facts of history).

8$^{30-59}$**.** 8$^{31 f.}$ Truth and knowledge are here combined with another concept met with in this section only: freedom. 'If you abide in my word, you are in truth my disciples', *i.e.* not connected with me in the Jewish, external, manner of connexion between teacher and disciple but in the internal manner, *i.e.* as spiritual beings sharing J's life and very existence. ἀληθῶς might be treated as equivalent to 'in the spiritual world', 'spiritually'. 'And you will know the truth — *i.e.* the spiritual reality — and the spiritual reality will make you free'. The mode of allegiance is different in the case of the members of the spiritual world from them who have identified themselves with the world of Darkness and Sin. The former, in spite of its complete dependence and strict all-pervading unity of obedience to the One, Divine, Will, is one of freedom. Every man who has not entered the Divine world, in the other hand, is a slave, however free he may imagine himself to be.

8^{33}. It is indeed missing the whole point of the controversy when one takes the Jews to misunderstand the freedom spoken of by J in a political or else literal sense. Here, as elsewhere, the Jews are only too ready to understand J's words symbolically. The 'freedom' of which the Jews were so sensitively proud (this pride is happily pictured by Jn) was *primarily* their freedom, *quā* God's people and possessors of the Tora, from idolatry and sin. Their freedom was guaranteed through the covenant with Yhuh, and Abraham, their 'father', was the 'covenanter' κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, the representative of Israel as alleged to God. Since the allegiance to God centered, further, in the acceptance of the Tōrā, the 'gift of the Torā' was the token of freedom. The reference to the promise of a future world-dominion for Israel (Gen 17^{16}, 22$^{17, 18}$) is not present here.

For the early Rabbinic conception of the religious freedom of Israel (*i.e.* of the Pharisees, the true observers of the Tora) one might point to

M^{e}*k̄* 3 c

רבי יהודה בן בתירה אומ׳ הרי הוא אומ׳ ולא שמעו אל משה מקוצר
רוח וגו׳ וכי יש לך אדם שהוא מתבשר בשורה טובה ואינו שמח שנאמר
יולד לך בן זכר שמח שמחהו רבו מוציאו לחירות ואינו שמח אם כן
למה נאמר ולא שמעו אל משה אלא שהיה קשה בעיניהם לפרוש מע״ז
שנ׳ ואו׳ אליהם איש שיקוצי עיניו השליכו ובגילולי מצרים אל תטמאו

»R. Y^{e}huđā ben Baƥira said: Lo, the Scripture says: (Ex 6^{9}) 'they hearkened not unto Moses for anguish of spirit (and for cruel bondage)'. And is there, then, a man who receives a good tiding and does not rejoice? It is written (Jer. 20^{15}) 'Cursed be the man who brought tidings to my father, saying, A man child is born unto thee, making him very glad. (Or is there a slave) whom his master brings out into freedom and he does not rejoice'. If that is so, why is it written 'they hearkened not unto Moses'? Answer: it was hard in their eyes to sever themselves from idolatry, as it is written (Ez. 20^{7}) 'then I said unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt'.» Thus, an O.T. context, plainly treating primarily of a 'political' liberation, the Rabbinic miđraš reinterprets into a symbolical sense: 'liberation from the bondage of idolatry'.

Similarly *Pæræq R. Mē'īr* (*Āƀōƥ* 6$_{2}$), quoted by Billerbeck, ii 522

ואומר והלחת מעשה אלהים המה והמכתב מכתב אלהים הוא חרות על הלחת אל תקרא חרות אלא חרות שאין לך בן חורין אלא מי שעוסק בתלמוד תורה

»And (the Scripture) says: 'And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven *(ḥārūƥ)* upon the tables (Exod. 32^{16}); read not *ḥārūƥ* (graven), but *ḥērūƥ* (freedom), for thou wilt find no freeman but him who is occupied in the learning of the Tora ...»[1]

TB Baƀ. M^{e}ṣ 85 b

כל המשים עצמו כעבד על דברי תורה בעוה"ז נעשה חפשי לעוה"ב

»Everyone who makes himself a slave in this world for the sake of the words of the Torā, he will be made a freeman in the world to come.» Cf. further *DeutR.* cited below p. 300, note 4.

8^{34}. Behind this utterance lies the commonly accepted truth of the relation between man's sin and the domination of יצר הרע *yéṣær hā-rāʿ*, the evil inclinations of the sinner it is said that the 'evil inclination *rules* over him'.[2] The speculations on this subject are already in full vogue at the time of the *Book of Sirach*.[3] The fundamental passage there is ch. 15$^{11-17}$.[1] In Rabbinical literature the references are very frequent. But it is to observed that, as Porter puts it, »in later discussions of the *yéṣær* the question at issue is not the speculative question of the relation of body and soul to the fact of sin, but the religious question of the relation of God and man to sin, and the practical question of the way of escape and victory».[2]

---

[1] C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 114.

[2] For the Rabbinic (and general Jewish) conceptions of the יצר־טוב, the 'good impulse' and יצר הרע the 'evil impulse' *vide* the excellent monograph by F. Ch. Porter, *The Yeçer Hara A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin (Biblical and Semitic Studies)* and Billerbeck, iv pp. 466—483.

[3] *Vide* F. Ch. Porter, *op. cit.* p. 137.

Of particular importance in the present connection are the following facts:[3] (1) according to Rabbinic opinion, the basis of

---

[1]
11 אל תאמר מאל פשעי כי את אשר שנא לא עשה
12 פן תאמר הוא התקילני כי אין צורך באנשי חמס
13 רעה ותעבה שנא ה׳ ולא יאננה ליראיו
14 אלהים מבראשית ברא האדם (וישתיהו ביד חותפו) ויתנהו ביד יצרו
15 אם תחפץ תשמר מצוה ואמונה לעשות רצונו
16 מוצק לפניך אש ומים באשר תחפץ שלח ידיך
17 לפני אדם חיים ומות אשר יחפץ ינתן לו

»11. Say not, My Transgression was of God; for that which he hateth he made not. 12. Lest thou say, He it was that made me stumble; for there is no need of men of violence. 13. Wickedness and an abomination the Lord hateth, and will not let it befall them that hear him. 14. God created man from the beginning (and put him in the hand of him that would spoil him), and gave him into the hand of his *yeṣær* (impulse to sin). 15. If thou choose, thou mayest keep the commandment; and it is faith to do his will. 16. Fire and water are poured out before thee; upon whichsoever thou choosest stretch forth thy hands. 17. Death and life are before a man, that which he shall choose shall be given him.»

[2] Porter, *op. cit.* p. 108.

[3] Illustrative for the whole complex of ideas in question is the long midrashic exposition on Satan, sin and evil inclination found in *TB Bāḇā Bāṯera* 15 b—17 a, from which it might be allowed to quote some excerpts:

ויהי היום ויבאו בני האלהים להתיצב על ה׳ ויבא גם השטן בתוכם ויאמר ה׳ אל השטן; מאין תבא וגו׳ משוט בארץ ומהתהלך בה אמר לפניו רבש״ע שטתי בכל העולם כולו ולא מצאתי נאמן כאברהם עבדך שאמרת לו קום התהלך בארץ לארכה ולרחבה כי לך אתננה... ויאמר ה׳ אל השטן השמת לבך אל עבדי איוב וגו׳ ותסיתנו בי לבלעו חנם א״ר יוחנן אלמלא מקרא כתוב אי אפשר לאומרו כביכול כאדם שמסיתין אותו וניסת. תנא יורד ומתעה עולה ומשטין נוטל רשות ונוטל נשמה... א״ר שמעון בן לקיש הוא שטן הוא יצר הרע הוא מלאך המות... ברא הקב״ה יצר הרע ברא לו תורה תבלין... (17 a) שלשה הטעימן הקב״ה בעולם הזה מעין עולם הבא ואלו הם אברהם יצחק ויעקב... שלשה לא שלט בהם יצה״ר ואלו הם אברהם יצחק ויעקב... וי״א אף דוד... ששה לא שלט בהם מלאך המות אלו הם אברהם יצחק ויעקב משה אהרן ומרים

sinfulness is not the *yéṣær hā-rāʿ* in itself but the domination of the *yéṣær*[1] over man, man's *slavery* under the *yéṣær.*[2] (2) There is a double use of the word 'sin', viz. on one hand it is used synonymously with 'sinful acts', on the other synonymously with *yéṣær hā-rāʿ*,[3] (3) freedom from slavery under the *yéṣær hā-rāʿ*, or mastery over the *yéṣær,* is a constitutive mark of the righteous,[4] (4) types of complete masters of the *yéṣær* are Abraham, Isaac

---

»(With reference to Hiob 1^{6}:) Satan said before Him (God): 'Lord of the Universe! I have been rummaging through the whole world and I have not found any *faithful* one like *Abraham, thy servant,* to whom Thou didst say (Gen 13^{17}) Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee.' ... (With reference to Hiob 2^{3}, one asks the question: Is Satan able to destroy a man altogether? A Bāraiþā answers: He (*i.e.* Satan) descends on earth and destroys (leads astray) a man, he ascends and accuses him, he receives authority (from God) and takes away the spirit ... R. Šimʿon b. Lāqiš said: Satan is = the Evil *yeṣær* and = the angel of death ... God created the evil *yeṣær,* but he created also the Torā as a remedy against it ... Three (men) the Holy One allowed to taste the other world already in this world: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob ... Three men (there were) whom the evil *yeṣær* did not master: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob ... and some say, even David ... three men (there were) whom the Angel of Death did not master: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aharon and Mirjam.» The passage is valuable as showing the natural connexion subsisting in Rabbinic expositions between Sin — Evil Yeṣar — Satan — Death on one hand and Abraham, the mastership over sin, the freedom granted Israel as Abraham's vow (Gen 13^{17}) on the other.

[1] The 'evil inclination' is often called simply *yéṣær.*

[2] *TB Sukka* 52 b; *TB Bᵉr.* 61 b *Bāraipa*, quoted below note 4.

[3] The parallel of *TB Sukka* 52 b, referred to in the preceding note, viz. *GenR* 22, has 'sin' instead of *yéṣær hā-rāʿ*. Similarly *Sukka* 52 a has a passage speaking of the *yéṣær ha-rāʿ*, which in almost identical form recurs in *GenR* 22, but with 'sin' instead of *yéṣær hā-rāʿ*. To one familiar with the Rabbinic sources the thesis of the frequent synonymity of *yéṣær hā-rāʿ* and sin *(ḥēṭ)* needs no demonstration. Cf. *Bāƀ. Bāp.* 17 a, quoted above p. 298 note 3.

[4] *TB Bᵉr.* 61 b, a *Bāraipā*:

תניא ר' יוסי הגלילי אומר צדיקים יצר הטוב שופטן שנאמר לבי חלל בקרבי. רשעים יצה"ר שופטן שנאמר נאם פשע לרשע בקרב לבי ובינונים זה וזה שופטן שנאמר כי יעמוד לימין אביון להושיע משופטי נפשי... ואמר רבא ידע איניש בנפשיה אי צדיק הוא או רשע

»R. Yose the Galilean (about 125 A.D.) said: The righteous, over them the good *yeṣær* rules, as it is written (Ps 109^{22}) »my heart (*libbi,* referred to the evil yeṣær), is pierced within me». The wicked, over them the evil yéṣær rules, as it is written (Ps 36^{1}) »the transgression of the wicked saith within my heart»; and the intermediate, the one and the other rule over them, as it is written (Ps 109^{31}) »for He shall stand at the right hand of the poor, to save him from *those* that rule over his soul» ... And Rabba said: A man knows in himself whither he is righteous or wicked.»

and Jacob,[1] (5) Abraham, Israels father, is in particular the prototype of a master of the *yéṣær* and is by himself, a guarantee of freedom from sin and *yéṣær hā-rāʿ*.[1] (6) *Yéṣær hā-rāʿ* is connected or even identified with Satan,[2] (7) as such the activity of the evil *yéṣær* is directed towards man's destruction, he is a 'man-slayer'.[3] (8) Israel, as destined to freedom from the *yéṣær*, is called the 'son' of God. (9) The means of freedom from the *yéṣær* and the basis of it is the *Tora* and the observance of, and study of the Tōrā; in the last instance, then, the *love of God*, consequently: the real origin of man's mastery over the *yéṣær*, is God himself; when obeying God, and mastering the evil *yéṣær*, the Israelites are 'the sons of God', God is their Father, and *vice versa:* in recognizing God as their Father, the Israelites are free from the dominion of evil *yéṣær* and sin.[4]

---

[1] Cf. *TB Bāƀ. Bāp̄.* 16 b—17 a quoted above p. 298 note 3. *TY B^{e}r.* 14 b אברהם אבינו עשה יה"ר טוב »(What does the expression 'a love like that of Abraham' mean? Answer:) Abraham, *our Father,* made the evil *yéṣær* good.» *TY Soṭa* 20 c, *CantR* 4_4 (Moses, David, and Ezra as masters over the evil *yeṣær; vide* Billerbeck, in 479 *cc.* end).

GenR 22_{12}

א"ר אבא... כמה דורות אבד יצה"ר דור אנוש ודור הפלגה ודור המבול כיון שעמד אברהם אבינו וראה שאין בו תוחלת התחיל מכחו הה"ד וכתותי מפניו צריו ומשנאיו אגוף

»R. Abba said: ... *how many generations did the evil yéṣær destroy!* The generation of Enosh, the generation of the confusion of tongues, and the generation of the deluge. But as soon as *our father Abraham* arose and saw that there was no (real) hope for it he began slaying it; this is the meaning of the scripture passage (Ps 89^{24}) 'And I did beat down his foes before his face etc.' Here the evil *yéṣær* is pictured as a '*murderer from the beginning*' (Jn 8^{44}); but it has power only over those who obey it; Abraham, again, is the first one (*i.e.* acc. to Jewish terminology, the head or father of those) who master the *yéṣær* and thereby become free.»

Israel, as the heirs of Abraham and as the possessors of the Tora, are granted freedom from the slavery under the evil *yéṣær: GenR* 22_{15} twice א"ת שאינו ברשותך כבר כתבתי בתורה ואליך תשוקתו ואתה תמשל בו »And if thou wouldst say that it (the evil yéṣær) is not in thy power, lo, I have written of old in the Tōrā (Gen 4^{7}) 'And unto thee shall be its desire, and thou shalt rule over him' *Tanḥuma* B^{e}rešīþ, »the evil *yéṣær* is given in thy hand (*i.e.* in thy power)».

[2] Cf. *TB Baƀ. Bap̄.* 16 a, above p. 298 note 3. Also *TB Ḥ^{a}ḡ.* 16 a, Billerbeck, iv 474, *TB Yōmā* 67 b compared with *Sifre* Lev. $18^{3f.}$

[3] Cf. the identification with the angel of death, above p. 298 note 3; further *ʾĀƀ. d^{e} R. Nāþān* 16.

[4] *Deut. R.* to 14^{1} cited by Schlatter, *S. v. H. 4 Ev.*, p. 95, »As a king who had delivered his Son out of slavery, commanded that the day of libera-

It might be urged that the utterances in the present section laid in the mouth of the Jews not only reproduce exactly the early Rabbinic conceptions but also constitute a picture, artistically drawn of the Rabbinic mode of reasoning. The section postulates a real first-hand knowledge of and familiarity with the Tannaitic mind as well as the Tannaitic world of ideas. The utterances ascribed to J also take as starting-point current Rabbinic notions, although — and this is in accordance with the whole trend of the Gospel — at the same time the J-utterances serve to underline the constitutive differences between Jewish ideas and the teaching of J. But precisely this constitution of the basic differences cannot be adequately grasped except on the basis of actually Rabbinic (*i.e.* Pharisaic) complexes of ideas.

8 35 ὁ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ὁ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. 8 36 ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε. This is a typical startling utterance by which the complete otherness of J's teaching and of the Divine world is brought forth. The hearers who, according to the sequel, by their acts acknowledge the devil as their father, are only *slaves*, not sons and freemen, in the world with which they have identified themselves, the world of darkness and essential falsehood. Therefore they do not even in their own world [the house, οἰκία] possess any abiding power. Only the member of the spiritual world is a son, who, *quā* son, abides 'for ever'. But here the essentiality of the Son comes in. There is no sonship, no 'abiding for ever', no freedom, except in and through *the* Son. Thence the startling, but thouroughly Jn-ine, transition to the subject of *the* Son as the deliverer of men from their false self-identification with the world of Darkness and deceptive freedom to the 'true' freedom.[1]

8 37—41. J speaks as a member of the Spiritual world, speaks

---

tion should be a day of festival, because on that day, he says, 'my son went out from *darkness* into *light*, from *iron* (rule) into *life*, from *slavery* into *freedom*, so also the Holy One lead Israel from slavery into freedom, as it is written (Deut. 14[1]) 'ye are the sons of the Lord your God'».

Cf. *Sifre Deut.* to the same passage (Deut. 14[1]), § 96: 'if you deport yourselves as sons, then you are sons; if not, you are not sons'. Thus R. Yᵉhuđā (about 140 A. D.). His contemporary, R. Mēʾīr said: 'in either case you are the sons of the Lord your God'. This is an often-cited passage. The relevant passages are numerous.

[1] G. P. Wetter, *Sohn Gottes*, p. 100 quotes Stobaios, Ekl. I. ed. Wachsmuth, p. 275_{18}, 276_{5} οὐδὲν ἐν σώματι ἀληθές, ἐν ἀσωμάτῳ τὸ πᾶν ἀψευδές, οὐδὲν ἐν οὐρανῷ δοῦλον, οὐδὲν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐλεύθερον. It is easily noticed that Jn is differently focussed.

out of this world to his hearers. He recognizes that they are Abraham's seed, but he denies that they are Abraham's children.[1] The clue to this distinction is: they have made an act of *self-severance* from their terrestrial as well as spiritual ancestor Abraham, so that he is in reality no longer their spiritual ancestor. The 'misunderstanding' of the Jews does not consist in their appeal to their earthly descent from Abraham, but in their failure to grasp that they — through their own acts — no longer belong to Abraham's spiritual world. »Abraham did not do such acts» (8^{40}), Abraham was spiritually seeing: he saw J's day, and was glad. Abraham recognized that J was 'of God' ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ πατρός. The Jews are blind to J's Divine origin: this shows that they are directed away from God's world to the world of 'another one'. Quite naturally such an utterance would to a Rabbinic mind imply an accusation of idolatry, an accusation which would hit the Jews on their sorest point, and, in particular, would seem to them to be the greatest injustice. Were not they, in the whole world, the party that with the greatest possible passion vindicated the absolute unity of the God, their Father: שמע ישראל ה' אלהינו ה' אחד. Thence the vehemence of their retort: 'We be not born of fornication[2], we have *one* Father, even God'.

8^{42}. However passionately the hearers uphold the belief in *one* God, the Father, they do not have him for Father. For in that case they would of necessity have of themselves — as spiritual beings — have recognized J. But now *J's words has no place in them* (8^{37}), hence, however much they, externally, adhere to the Torâ, they do *not hear God's words* (8^{47}) they do not understand J's external words, because they do not hear his word (8^{43}) = they do not apprehend the Divine-spiritual reality (cf. $5^{24\text{f.}}$, 5^{37}). The reason why they do not apprehend it, is that they are not 'of God', ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (8^{47}), they are outside the Divine-spiritual world.[3]

---

[1] »He distinguishes between σπέρμα Ἀβρ. and τέκνα Ἀβρ.»: Bauer, *J. Ev.*^{2} p. 121.

[2] Fornication is the Rabbinic as well as O.T. simile for idolatry.

[3] In strangly resembling terms the Mandæans express themselves against the Jews:

GR XII 5 277^{3-36} (*Pet* 277^{10-25})

ואילה̄ ליומא בישא דמטארלון ליאהוטאייא באלמא וארין אולא והאצדיא הצאדא
ד̄כארבא השוכא מליא ליבאיהון ואינאיהין סאימא ולאנאהרא טביא לגאטינהון

8^{44}. Definitely, then, it is stated, that the Jews addressed are of the 'devil', in the literal sense of the expression, they have become immerged in the world of Saṭan, nationalized, so to speak, as the citizens of the realm of which he is the ruler; they have moreover become his children, his will has been infused into them.

At this point it is important to note what it is that constitutes the world of Saṭan. Evidently this is not primarily the terrestriality, or corporeality, but the fact of the opposition against, or rather, the severance from the Divine world. Saṭan has set up Falsehood against the Truth of the Spiritual world, or, rather, severed himself from the Truth, and therewith constituted the ψεῦδος (falsehood, lie). The very insensibility of the world of falsehood to the world of truth is what constitutes the former, or, perhaps better, the world of falsehood has been created by the constitution of such an insensibility to the world of Truth. It is the very act of *self-severance from the Divine world* which is the origin of Saṭan's world.

With this accords that Saṭan is called »the Father of the Lie» (8^{44}).[1]

In the exposition of Saṭan's role as the originator of the world of Lie, of death and Darkness, Jn most clearly bases upon and consciously links up with Rabbinic-Jewish ideas. This has been admirably shown by Büchsel, who also analyses the peculiarly Jn-ine features of the conception.[2] Büchsel recognizes that Jn in every probability presupposes the idea of the Fall of Saṭan, and

---

ולאהאזילה לאתאר נהור... קאימיא לבאר מן כושטא ומשאמשיא לבאר מן
טאבותא... תורא ד̄מותא הינון ד̄בנאת אנאשא גאטליא

»Woe to the evil day that is preserved for the Jews in the world! They sow crime and harvest an harvest of *Lie*. Their heart is *full of finsternis* and *their eyes are blind* and do not shine. Delusion seized them and *they did not see the abode of Light* ... *They stand outside Kušṭa* (Jn ἀλήθεια) and do service outside Goodness (Grace)... They are the Gate of *Death* and *kill the children of men.*» Cf. also in the present connection:

GL III 75 588—589^{6} (*Pet* $131^{20}-132^{12}$), the Spirit speaks: 'The *evil Ones* lead me astray ... and my heart *caused me to think of everything evil*, and my tongue, *through Lie* brought me to fall. Mandā dHayye, the messenger of all messengers, spoke to me: O spirit! When *I called thee*, then thou didst not answer ... because thou didst *love* dream and *deception* thou shalt fall into the kettles (the abode of punishment).'

[1] Thus most naturally καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ. Cf. Büchsel, *J. u. h. Synkr.*, p. 104, note 4, and Bauer, *ad loc.* (*J. Ev.*^{2}, p. 123).

[2] Büchsel, *op. cit.*, pp. 103—106.

this fall as a fall from the truth; and that this latter trait is peculiarly Jn-ine. With this observation accords what we have ventured to maintain above. It might be concluded, then: the *origin of the world of Darkness,* acc. to Jn, *is the fall of Saṭan, and this fall consists in his self-severance from the Divine Life. The members of the world of Saṭan have become such members by such acts of self-severance, and, consequently upon that, self-identification with the world of separateness.* 8^{47} fits in exactly with this interpretation. The hearers are unable really to hear, because they *'are not of God':* they are severed from God's world.

From this exposition it is clear that there cannot be any question of a dualism between God and the devil, in the sense of two independent, opponent powers. Nor is there any dualism in the conception of the Divine world, the world of Light, and the World of Darkness. There is a duality, an antithesis. The moral and religious bearing of this antithesis is connected precisely with the self-separation from the Divine of that which by nature belongs to the Divine and its self-identification with 'this world'.

$8^{48, 49}$. For the question concerning the position and sympathies of the circle for which Jn writes, these two verses give inportant hints. Once it is remarkable that the Jews accuse J of being a Samaritan. It is certainly correct, as Bernard[1] does, to connect this with vss. 39, 40, where J is reported as »combating» the claim of the Jews »to be the true children of Abraham», and as challenging »their boasted spiritual privileges». For »this was a principal point with the Samaritans, who would never allow that the Jews had any exclusive right to the promises made to Abraham and his seed». Secondly, the fact, that J, while rejecting the second part of the retorts of the Jews' (καὶ δαιμόνιον ἔχεις), does not by a word reject the imputation that he was a Samaritan, cannot, in view of the subtlety of the writer, be taken merely as accidental: it must be understood as serving a positive purpose, *viz.* to convey the truth that *J actually was willing to own himself in sympathy with the Samaritans against the Jews.* (Cf. above pp. 188 ff. and 208 f.)

8^{51} is the progressive parallel to 5^{24}, hence the meaning is: the believer who holds fast to and keeps the word of J, he will at the time of physical death pass directly into the realm of the Divine-spiritual reality, he will not behold 'death', *i.e.* that which with people in general, with unbelievers, is implied in the physical death, *viz.* the beginning of the existence as νεκρός (cf. above on 5^{25}).[1]

---

[1] *Gospel acc. to St. John* ii, p. 316.

$8^{52\,\mathrm{ff.}}$ The distinction made between θεωρήσῃ in J's words and γεύσηται in the Jews' repetition of those words should probably be understood as intentionally conveying the antithesis between J's conception of the escape of death and that of the Jews. The Rabbinic expression was, to be sure: 'not to taste death' לא טעם מיתה. This expression was used of the escape of physical death, which escape was thought to have been the privilege of some exceptionally righteous or holy men. At the time of J it is certain, that as such were counted Enoch and Elijah[2]; probably also Messiah was reckoned to this class. It deserves notice, however, that the speculations on the 'immortality' of Enoch and Elijah were especially cherished in the mystical circles. It might be surmised, that the Jews when asking 'whom makest Thou Thyself?' (8^{53}), are (acc. to Jn) subtly conveying that J makes the claim of being Enoch or Elijah or a compeer of these. The exclamation 'surely, thou art not greater than our father Abraham!' would then be directed not only against J specifically but also against the over-valuation current in mystical circles of Enoch and Elijah. This is, however, a mere guess. The actual speculations or ideas alluded to here, are perhaps impossible to determine with any probability. What would serve as a secondary support for the hypothesis of a possible allusion to the Enoch-mysticism is the consideration that this mysticism seems to afford a clue to a particular problem of the argument of the Jews. The problem is this: J's claim is that his *followers* will escape death, whereas the Jews answer him, as if his claim had been simply that *He himself* was exempt from death. The Enoch-mysticism now seems to supply the natural connexion between those claims, *viz.* through the idea that the ideal saint (*e.g.* Enoch) through his own escape of death *eo ipso* acquires a peculiar function of guide for those who aspire to immortality[1] or takes special charge over the spirits of the righteous.

---

[1] One might hence translate 'death' with 'mortality', corresponding to a possible translation of 'life' with 'eternal life'. In this case it must, however, be understood, that 'mortality' with Jn would mean exactly this existence in perishable states of manifestation, first in earthly life and then in the 'life' as νεκρός, whereas immortality would be the possession of the Divine-spiritual life, which is imperishable, eternal. *Vide* above p. 211, n. 1. This immortality stands in strange correlation to the Rabbinic expression 'destined to Eternal Life' מוומן לחיי העולם הבא (*TB Ber* 61 b, *MQ* 9 a, *Kep* 103 b, *TY Kel.* 32 b, *TẎ Kep* 35 a [*ʿOb. Zārā* 10 b, 17 a], vide Billerbeck ii pp. 726, 727 ad *Act* 13^{48}) מוומן is not identical with »written down for», but implies an immediate quality of immortality = adherence to the Divine world, given to earthly men.

[2] Later records enumerate: Enoch, Elijah, Messiah, Eliezer (Abraham's servant), Hiram, Ebed-melech the Ethiopian, Yaʿbes (the son of Juda the Patriarch), Biþya (the daughter of Pharao) and Seraḥ (the daughter of Ašer): *Dær. ʾÆr. Zuṭ.* 1 (19 a).

8^{56-58}. Abraham, as a 'true' member of the spiritual world (as against the 'liars', vs. 55, who falsely claim him as their father) of necessity knows J. This is the general trend of the section, and the case of Abraham again is an instance of the general rule: the holy men of Scripture, the 'fathers' and the 'prophets', like the Scripture itself, belong to the spiritual world and hence share in the living reality of J.

The specific problem of vs. 56 centres in the two questions (1) in what period of his existence did Abraham 'rejoice to see Christ's day' and actually see it? and (2) what is meant by Christ's day? Neither question can be answered without having recourse to contemporaneous Jewish speculations. Also the exegetes generally point to Philo, *De mutatione nominum* 130 seqq., in order to support the theory that the time of the promise of the birth of Isaac and then Isaac's actual birth, as symbolically interpreted, are alluded to by vs. 56.[2] But the right perspective, it would seem, may be obtained only with consideration of the whole trend of the Jewish speculations and legendary expressions with regard to Abraham. Expositors really versed in Jewish speculations seem to have been driven as by a natural necessity towards the association of Jn 8^{50} with the narrations of God's revelations to Abraham (in visions etc.) of coming events.[3] What would lend special weight to this association, in the opinion of the present writer, is the fact — strangely enough hitherto overlooked — that in the narratives of this kind a stereotypical formula recurs: »when he saw . . . he rejoiced» (cf. εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη). The fact that such revelations are narrated not only as given to Abraham, but also to Adam, Moses, Elijah or some other prophet, does not lessen the importance of the association: in the case of Jn there is a parallel phenomenon, viz. the statements that *Isaiah* saw his glory (Jn 12 41) and Moses wrote of Him (5 46). It seems safe to assume that the Jewish speculation in question form the background of J's sayings in Jn 8 56 ff. The expression 'my day', then, would allude in particular to the 'day of the Son of Man' (Burney[1]).

---

[1] Cf. H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch,* Introd., pp. 79, 80, 96, 113 e.

[2] *Vide* Lagarde, *Évangile selon Saint Jean,* pp. 253—255, cf. also Bauer, *ad loc.*

[3] So Westcott (pointing to *GenR.* 44_{20}), Burney (*Aram. Origin 4 Gospel*, p. 111 n., referring to the Tarqumical renderings of Gen. 15 and, especially, Billerbeck ii, pp. 525, 526 quoting and referring to numerous passages.

Difficulties are: if J's saying bases upon the traditional beliefs in question, why do the Jews take objection to it on the ground that it implies not only Abraham having seen J but J having seen Abraham? The solution tentatively proffered by Bauer[2] that Jn has taken over from some other source a controversial dialogue not fitting in the present context does not satisfy, since Jn never makes a lapse of this kind. The reversal implied by vs. 57 must be intentional and belong to the class of startling utterances so typical for Jn. The only solution possible seems to be that precisely through this reversal Jn wants to convey that J has made it clear to his hearers that the relation between J and Abraham was not to be expressed simply as a prevision from the side of Abraham of the future 'day of J', but instead as an actual interrelation in the spiritual world. From this it would follow also that the question whether Abraham saw J during his lifetime or after (in 'Paradise') loses momentum. The answer is: he 'rejoiced in the anticipation of J's day during his lifetime, he saw it during his lifetime (as the Scripture symbolically teaches) and then continued being aware of it while living *in* Jesus as a spiritual being. Specifically, however, the 'day of J', as his entrance into earthly life, was naturally seen by Abraham at the time of its arrival, *i.e.* at the time of J's birth and his self-revelation as the Son of Man.

The real stress, however, lies, not on the specific moment of the arrival of J's day and of Abraham's vision, but on the temporal and existential all-inclusiveness[3] of J as the centre of the spiritual world. This is underlined by vs. 58: ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί, 'before Abraham was, I am'.

The expositor who has best grasped the depths of the present section is perhaps Adalbert Merx.[4] Merx too, has in the Jewish

---

[1] *Aram. Origin 4 Gospel,* p. 111 n. (on p. 112).

[2] *Joh. Ev.*² ad loc.

[3] Cf. Vacher Burch, *The Structure and Message of St. John's Gospel,* p. 91: »Jesus' tells ... (men) ... that Abraham rejoiced to see His day. This was one of His pictorial ways of telling men and women *how He and His revelation were timeless*».

[4] *Das Ev. d. Joh. erläutert,* Berlin 1911, pp. 182—235 ...

(and Samaritan) Gnostic (Midrašic) speculations found the only possible key to the understanding of the import of the controversy. Quite rightly he points out that these speculations are not 'dogmatically exact' but fleeting and plastic.[1] Thus, it should be in accordance with Merx's premises to state, it is rather the evasive underlying system of imaginations, the general trend of speculations, which forms the background, than any specific idea, let alone dogma. This seems also to have been in his mind.[2] In Merx's exposition, however, one misses the stress on the complete difference between the standpoint of J and that of the Jews which Jn wants to conwey. Thus, when Merx seems to hint that the objection taken by the Jews is directed towards the self-presumption of J as a pre-existent Messiah in line with the Jewish speculations on this figure, this must be stated to go beside the point. J makes a much greater claim than to be identical with the pre-existent Messiah of the Jewish speculations. He claims to be the over-existent and ever-central Son, to whom everything and every being of the spiritual world are constitutively and essentially related; their very existence in the spiritual world being bound up with him as truly and necessarily as they are bound up with the Father. This could be no better expressed in the current mystical language than with J's application to Himself of the Divine Name אהיה אשר אהיה.

With this statement we approach the final problem with regard to the present section: the import of the ἐγὼ εἰμί. Perhaps nowhere in Jn is it more apparent, how misleading a mere linguistic investigation might be. In spite of the fact, that the Aramaic or Hebrew equivalent of πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμί would, from a linguistic standpoint, be exactly and, perhaps even best, constructed simply as לפני אברהם אנכי *et. sim.* (Lightfoot[3], Merx[4]), the whole context and the solemn introduction postulate beyond any possible doubt that the meaning to be conveyed is something more than »I exist, or have come into being, before Abraham». As Archbishop Bernard says[1], »it is clear that J means to represent Jesus as thus claiming for Himself the timeless being of Deity, as distinct from the temporal existence of man». Comparative agreement seems to obtain that the ἐγὼ εἰμί actually represents an appropriation by J of a Divine Name. Of the different possibilities, *viz.* that the name in question was the Tetragrammaton (Klein[2]), the אהיה אשר אהיה of *Exod.* 3^{14}, the prophetical אני הוא (Deut. 32^{39}, Isa 43^{10}, 46^{4}, 48^{12}), or a title of divine being taken over from the Hellenistic environment (Wetter[3]), the general consensus seems to verge towards אני הוא. As support for the last-named expression one might forward (1) that it fits in very well with the linguistic construction of the phrase (to be rendered approximately: קודם שנבבא אברהם אני הוא), (2) that אני הוא in the O.T., while avoiding the Divine Name, clearly suggests it (3) that we have in LXX Ps 90^{2} πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γεννηθῆναι . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος σὺ εἶ an all but literal parallel to the present phrase.[4]

---

[1] A. Merx, *op. cit.,* pp. 181 f.: »... es bleibt stets zu berücksichtigen, dass alle diese Anschauungen weich und nicht zu dogmatischer Exaktheit durchgebildet sind. Das Ganze ist nebelhaft unbestimmt und wurde verschieden vorgestellt ...»

[2] A. Merx, *op. cit.,* p. 183: »Alle diese Notizen sollen dazu dienen, die *Denkweise* des Judentums, wie sie in der Zeit des Abfassungs des Evangeliums war, dem modernen Leser näher zu rücken, denn ohne sie lassen sich die Betrachtungen über die Abrahamskinde und Abrahams Sehnsucht doch nicht verstehen.»

[3] *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ,* p. 1047.

[4] *op. cit.,* p. 179.

The present writer, however, would suggest that the Divine Name intended is to be sought rather on the side of אהיא אשר אהיה, *i.e.* in the speculations evolved from *Exod.* 3^{14}, than in the אני הוא. A review of contemporaneous and earlier mystical Name-speculations recalls the extreme importance given not so much to the אהיה אשר אהיה as to the single אהיה. In fact, the mystical speculations concerning the Divine Names were focussed precisely in *two* Names κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, *viz.* (1) the Tetragrammaton יהוא and (2) the אהיה.[5] Whereas the אהיה אשר אהיה does not fit in linguistically with the phrase πρὶν ᾽Αβρααμ etc., this is eminently the case with קודם שנברא אברהם אני אהיה : אהיה. This would excellently reproduce the Jn-ine style: this rendering alone gives the perfect double meaning, firstly 'before Abraham was, I am' and secondly 'before Abraham was, I am אהיה (He who bears the Divine Name אהיה)'.

There is a parallel phenomenon in Jewish mystical literature which might be adduced here. Of Metatron it is said: 'He, (God) called me the little יהוה', further: 'Seventy names did I (God) take from my names and called him by them to enhance his glory'. In the enumerations of the Divine Names and of the Names given to Meṭaṭron the two names 'the little יהוה' and the אהיה are the central names, from which the other names are evolved.[1] It should be remarked, however, that the Name אהיה, to its import, is always consciously linked up with אהיה אשר אהיה, or with *Exod* 3^{14}. Hence, with regard to sense implied, it represents the Divine Attribute of 'changelessness' and 'uniqueness';[2] as a Divine Name, again, it might perhaps, with some hesitation, be defined as 'the first emanation of the Tetragrammaton'. The אהיה, hence, plays the part of λόγος and is associated with pre-existence as well as ever-existence.[3]

---

[1] *The Gospel according to St. John,* ii, p. 322, cf. *Introduction,* p. cxxi.

[2] *Der älteste christliche Katechismus,* pp. 44 ff., 55 ff.

[3] *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken,* 1915, pp. 224 ff.

[4] Cf. Bernard, *The Gospel acc. to St. John, ICC,* ii, p. 322.

[5] Instances given in H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch,* Translation with Notes, pp. 161, 173, 174.

Against the theory of ἐγώ εἰμί = אני הוא, it may be argued, is the fact that אני הוא, as a solemn declaration by J, would equal 'I am God' or 'I am the Father', a declaration that is clearly out of keeping with the general bearing of J's self-predicative utterances. Ἐγὼ εἰμί = אהיה, again, as implying the appropriation of the Divine Name, would equal 'I and the Father are one', the central, reiterated thesis of J in Jn.

9^{4,5}. (1) ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με . . . On the basis of the interpretation of the 'we' of Jn 3^{11} above there will be no difficulty in accepting the reading ἡμᾶς. J speaks from the centre of the Divine World, where all works of God, activity in unity with the Divine will, is included in him. (Cf. above on 6^{26} seqq.)[4] Hence the expression ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι etc. is no »mere maxim of experience» but has special reference to the ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ.[1]

---

[1] *Šiʿur Qoma(i), 3 Enoch* 12^5, 48 B^1, 48 $C^{7,9}$, 48 D^1.

[2] *Vide* Bernard, *op. cit.*, Introd., p. cxxi.

[3] Cf. the Samaritan quotation given by Merx, *op. cit.* p. 182 (not used by him for the purpose of elucidating the expression ἐγὼ 'εἰμί):

יום דלביש אדם הצלם לביש משה קרן אורה וכלילה דאכתיב עליו אהיה אשר
אהיה מן ארבע אצטדיו

»On the day (of First Beginnings, 'Berēšīþ) when Adam clad himself in the Divine Image, Moses (as pre-existent) clad himself in the Splendour of the Original Light and in the Crown, on the four sides of which is written אהיה אשר אהיה»; the Name here clearly associates with the idea of pre-existence.

Cf. also the Mandæan *G. R.* XII 4 of Manda dHayye: »He is the First Life, the Life that was from of old ... He was the great splendour, when the spirit came out from the House of the Great Life.»

[4] Cf. v. Harnack, *Das Wir im Johannesevang.* etc., p. 107: »Jesus spricht auch hier von sich im »Wir» als potenziertes »Ich», weil im gewissen Sinn *alles Gotteswirken sein Wirken ist* ...»

(2) ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νὺξ ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι. (3) ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὦ φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου proffers difficulties. The continuous activity spoken of Jn 5^{17} seems here to be exchanged for an activity limited to J's earthly existence. Even if it is true, that J's 'time' in a special sense is = the time of his ministry upon earth, it would be quite against the whole Jn-ine system of thought to say that the end of J's earthly activity would mark the beginning of a 'night', a period of darkness, when all spiritual activity would be excluded. In particular it is the expression ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι, in which the difficulty centres. The solution of the difficulty is perhaps to be found by taking into consideration that the Jesus-utterances in question form an integral part of the narrative of the man born blind. They form a natural continuation of 9^{3}, which is wholly within the purview of the narrative. The unmistakably discursive character of Jn $9^{4,5}$, hence, must not obscure the fact that the dictum presupposes the situation of the narrative. Just as J at a definite time is the light of the blind man, so he is in a definite relation to the temporal continuity of men in general, *i.e.* of the 'world'. Consequently, 'the night when nobody can work' does not refer to the temporal history of J, but to the history of men, *i.e.* it refers primarily to a certain period of men's existence which can be thus characterized. Which is this period?

This question might be perhaps answered if it be allowed that Jn $9^{39,41}$ forms a direct allusive continuation — from the discursive point of view — of $9^{4,5}$. And as the topic of judgement is introduced here, this is clearly by manner of retrospection on 5^{19-29}. Now, there is a certain parallelism between the conceptions of 'death' and 'life' of Jn 5^{19-29} on one hand, and those of 'blind' and 'seeing' of $9^{4,5,39,41}$ on the other. Realizing this, it might be possible to define the time »when no one can work» as the period of men's life when they cannot pass directly from darkness into light.

Even here, however, the parallel seems to fail: the natural equivalent of the period of darkness would seem to be the time of the »state of being dead». The state of the dead, again, acc. to 5^{19-29}, offers the possibility of life, whereas the state of darkness of the 'night' seems to exclude such a possibility. This makes it necessary to press the parallelism farther, and point to the expression used in 5^{19-29} of »hearing the Son's voice». Then it becomes clear that the 'night' is neither the period beginning with J's death, nor the period of men's existence in the state of the 'dead', but the period beginning with the discursive judgement for those who, although having the possibility of seeing, condemn themselves to blindness because they do reject the light that comes to them. The night, then, refers to the »darkening of moral (or rathers spiritual) vision which is caused by complacent satisfaction with the light that is already enjoyed ... Those who see only dimly, and do not desire to see more clearly, lose the power of sight wholly; they become blind».[1]

---

[1] Bernard, *The Gospel acc. to St. John,* ii, p. 326.

To proceed: $9^{4,5,39,41}$ should be put in relation to 3^{19-21}. There we meet with the same correlation of the ideas of 'judgement', 'light' and 'darkness'; there, too, the 'light', is viewed in its relation to the world. If the question were to be put: what would correspond to the term 'night' in 3^{19-21}? the answer would have to be: the period of men's existence marked by their turning away from the Light, their self-judgement.

The next step is the taking into consideration again of the inclusive aspect of the Son of Man in relation to the expressions (A) ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν, (B) ἔρχεται νύξ ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι and (C) ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ᾦ, φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου. Although (A) primarily refers to J's doing the Father's works, it also includes the believers, for 'it is the work of God to believe in Him whom God has sent' (Jn 6^{29}). Now one might state: for the believers there will ever be day; there will never come any 'night' for the believers, just as there will be no 'death' for them (5^{24}). (B) as has been maintained above refers to the unbelievers only. (C), lastly, — 3^{19-21} and $9^{39,41}$ constantly kept in view — serves to underline the nature of J's activity, and does *not* admit of any negative corrollary. The cause of the failure to grasp the real import of $9^{4,5}$ is that the reader is almost as by a hypnotical force mislead into adding to 9^{5} a parallel to 9^{4b}, that parallel then naturally forming itself into some such sentence as »the time cometh, when I shall no longer be in the world etc.» As soon as this false deduction is removed, the consistency of the interpretation here put forth will, it is hoped, be apparent.

---

[1] Bernard, *The Gospel acc. to St. John,* ii, p. 340.

10^{1-18}. The difficulties of the present section might be summarized under the three headings (1) J as the Shepherd at the same time as the Door, (2) J as the Door leading to the Flock at the same time as the Door for the use of the Flock, (3) the identity of the 'thief', 'robberer', 'hireling' or 'stranger'.

The difficulties of interpretation are unsurmountable as long as the exact identity of the Fold and of the Flock remain undefined or incorrectly defined. The usual identification of the Flock with the Christian Church, or with the specific community behind the Fourth Gospel, does not enable us to explain the sequence of ideas or the coherence of J's sayings. Instead of having recourse to the hypothesis that Jn has taken over an allegorical discourse, the original elements of which he has not been able to fit in with his own purpose, or similar[1] theories, the correct method is attempting to find an identification that is in keeping with the Jn-ine spheres of ideas in general and gives unity and coherence to the discourse.

This truth once admitted, it appears that such an attempt need not move within mere guess-work or arbitrary hypotheses. One has only to admit that J in every self-predicatory utterance speaks of one and the same subject, *viz.* the spiritual reality, in order to realize that also in 10^{1-18} the subject is: the Divine-spiritual world and J as the all-inclusive centre of that world by virtue of his unity with His Father.

The sheepfold, then, is the Divine-spiritual world into which J seeks to lead men through his coming into the 'world', his 'work', his 'love unto death'. The sheep are those who 'listen to his voice', recognize him, and hence 'enter through him' into the Divine reality. Already at this point it will be clear, that with this interpretation there is no difficulty in the dual dicta: »I am the Shepherd» and »I am the Door». This duality is on the contrary a necessary expression of one of the central theses of Jn and has as its parallels other characteristic dual utterances: »J *gives* the Bread of Life». and »J *is* the Bread of Life», »He *shows* the Way» and »He *is* the Way», »He *teachers* the Truth» and »He *is* the Truth». In fact, so far from having been unable to 'melt into a unity' various 'foreign' conceptions and similes, the juxtaposition of the terms 'Door' and 'Shepherd' in self-predicatory dicta is precisely that intentionally startling feature by which J seeks to convey the peculiar truths of the Divine-spiritual World and of J's activity and ministry.

---

[1] *e.g.* Bauer, *Joh. Ev.*^{2}, p. 138: »Innerlich zusammengehalten wird die Perikope 10_{1-21} nur durch die Begriffe der Schafe, des Hirten und seiner Gegenspieler. Aber diese sind bald Fremde, denen die Schafe nicht gehören, bald Diebe und Räuber oder auch wieder Mietlinge. Das geht nebeneinander her und durcheinander hin. Aus dem Hirten wird im Laufe der Ausführungen der gute Hirt, und zwischen beiden steht die Tür, zunächst vielleicht zu den Schafen, dann sicher für die Schafe. Dieses unausgeglichene Gewoge fordert fast zu seiner Erklärung die Annahme, dass der Evangelist hier *allerlei fremde Bilde und Begriffe* übernommen hat *ohne die Kraft, sie zu einer Einheit zusammenzuschmelzen.*»

»I am *the* Good Shepherd» conveys the essentiality of J: There is no shepherd apart from J. »I am the Door» conveys the all-inclusiveness of J: everyone entering the Divine-spiritual reality enters through J.

For connexions of the simile 'the Shepherd' or 'the Good Shepherd' it should not be necessary to go into any controversy with the expositors who with all their might try to linkup with so called 'Hellenistic'[1] notions. Even Bauer does not dare to advocate the 'heathen influences'[2] on this point. Likewise the generally known O.T. and synoptic instances might be passed in silence. Among Rabbinic instances of the use of the terms 'Shepherd', 'Faithful Shepherd' and 'Good Shepherd' reference should first of all be made to $M^{e}k$ 13 d, 14 a. This passage, which has been quoted in full above pp. 138, 139, is important not only for its close parallelism of phraseology and expression with the present section[3] but also — and this, strangely enough, has never been noted before — for its successive introduction of both the present terms, viz. the 'Shepherd' and the 'Door' or 'Gate'. The Rabbinic background for the said terms is seen also in *ExodR.* 2, *P^e^siqpa R.* 26, where the exact counterpart of *ποιμὴν καλ'ς, viz.* רועה יפה, occurs.[1] The term רועה יפה is found in an identical sense also in *ExodR.* 11 as Schlatter has printed out.[2] The Rabbinic passages show that as a 'Good Shepherd' (apart from God himself) are primarily accounted 'Moses' but also 'anyone of the prominent Holy men or prophets of Israel'.

---

[1] In the sense of un-Oriental, or un-Palestinian ideas, as the case may be, an obviously muddle-headed conception of 'Hellenism'.

[2] »heidnischer Einfluss», a strange and un-scientific term.

[3] This has been excellently analysed by Paul Fiebig in his article »*Die Mekhilta und das Johannes-Evangelium*» in ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ, i, p. 57 ff., where he, however, quotes only a lesser part of the passage. It may be allowed to reproduce Fiebig's comments at some length: »Merkwürdigerweise bieten Strack-Billerbeck diese tannaitische Stelle nicht, wo zu Joh. 10_{11} von Parallelen die Rede ist. Jesus sagt Joh. 10_{11}: ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. Damit stellt er alle anderen »guten Hirten» in den Hintergrund. Er ist »der gute Hirte». In dieser Betonung liegt hier das Originale, nicht aber in der Bezeichnung als »guter Hirt». Bei der heutigen Neigung der neutestamentlichen Forschung, das Joh.-Evg. in allererster Linie zu Philo, den Mysterien und Ähnlichem in Beziehung zu setzen, denkt man nun, wie Grill in seinen reichhaltigen und wichtigen Untersuchungen zum Joh.-Evg. etwa daran, dass Dionysos als ποιμήν bezeichnet wird, auch als βουκόλος. Das bedeutet aber Rinderhirt, während Joh. 10 an einen

Of instances *not* adduced by Billerbeck the following may be quoted

TB Ḥ^a^ḡ. 3 b

כולם נתנו מרועה אחד אל אחד נתנן פרנס אחד אמרן מפי אדון כל המעשים ברוך הוא

»All (the precepts of the Tōrā) were given (*i.e.* handed down) by one *shepherd* (*scil.* Moses) etc.»

Schafhirten gedacht ist. So weist Grill noch auf Orpheus hin; er hätte auch an Attis erinnern können, Gestalten, bei denen Schafe als Attribute begegnen. Auch an die Aussagen Philos über den Logos als Hirten könnte man denken, an Poimandres und den Hermes κριοφόρος. Möglich ist, dass der Evangelist auch solche »Hirten» hat in den Hintergrund drängen wollen. Im Munde Jesu selber dürfte an derartige Beziehungen schwerlich zu denken sein. Aber nun ist folgendes Tatsache: ποιμὴν καλός = רעה יפה ist, wie Str.-B. nachweisen, rabbinisch, und anderswo ist diese genaueste Entsprechung nirgends belegt. רעה טוב = guter Hirte ist damit gleichbedeutend und ebenfalls bei den Rabbinen geläufig. Franz Delitzsch in seinem hebräischen NT, das ja für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft von grösster Bedeutung ist, sagt daher hier: רעה טוב. Unser obiger Text hat רעה נאמן = ein treuer Hirte, was denselben Sinn hat. Die Bezeichnung klingt am genauesten in Ps Sal 17_{40} f. an, wo der Messias als treuer Hirte beschrieben wird. Im übrigen sind in der jüdisch-rabbinischen Gedankensphäre Moses, David, die Propheten die »guten Hirten». Alle diese Beziehungen sind schon im Munde Jesu durchaus möglich, ebenso in dem Gedankenkreis des 4. Evangeliums, das ja doch eine sehr reichhaltige, tiefgehende jüdisch-hebräisch-aramäische Seite hat, die heutzutage noch zu viel wenig beachtet zu werden pflegt. Eine derartige Eigenheit ist das Denken in gegensätzlichen Parallelismen, das auch in dem obigen Text der Mekhilta hervortritt. Ebenso denkt das Joh.-Evg. gern von Jesus zu Gott, wie obiger Text von Moses zu Gott und umgekehrt, und zwar verbunden mit »glauben». Man vergleiche besonders Joh. 14_{1}: πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε, ebenso 12_{44}, wozu also Schlatter a. a. O. mit Recht obige Mekh.-Stelle heranzieht: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ πιστεύει εἰς ἐμέ, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με.»

[1] The passages are quoted by Billerbeck, ii, p. 536, 537.

[2] *Spr. u. Heim. 4 Ev.*, p. 393.

As in M^ek 13 d 14 a Moses' function of *shepherd* is connected with his predestined function as *Saviour:*

Exod R. 2_4

ומשה היה רועה כל מי שכתוב בו היה מתוקן לכך הן אדם היה
מתוקנת היתה המיתה לבא לעולם שנא׳ והושך על פני תהום זו מיתה
שמחשיך פני הבריות ..... ומשה לגאולה מתחלת ברייתם נתקנו לכך

»'And Moses was a shepherd. Everyone of whom the word היה is used (together with a verb) is predestined for that (which the verb denotes). Thus (when the Scripture says) אדם היה it denotes that death was destined to come into the world through him, as it is written 'and darkness was upon the face of the deep' (Gen 1^2), *i.e.* death, that darkens the face of the world (lit. the created beings, men) — [the *serpent* (Gen 3^2) was destined to bring retributions. Noah was destined to bring *salvation.* Josef was destined to bring maintenance *(parnāsā)* etc.] and Moses (was destined to bring) salvation. From the beginning of their creation they were destined for such (and such function).»[1]

The *Flock* acc. to Rabbinical typology is generally = Israel. Israel is the flock of the Holy One. Moses, or some other prominent figure of the O.T., is the Shepherd of the flock. Thus *e.g.*

Exod R. 2_3

אין הקב״ה נותן גדולה לאדם עד שבודקהו בדבר קטן ואח״כ מעלהו
לגדולה. הרי לך שני גדולי עולם שבדקן הקב״ה בדבר קטן נמצאו נאמנים
והעלן לגדולה בדק לדוד בצאן ולא נהגם אלא במדבר להרחיקם מן הגזל
שכן אליאב אומר לדוד ועל מי נטשת מעט הצאן ההנה במדבר מלמד
שהיה דוד מקיים המשנה אין מגדלים בהמה דקה בא״י. א״ל הקב״ה
נמצא אתה נאמן בצאן בא ורעה צאני שנאמר מאחר עלות הביאו. וכן
במשה הוא אומר וינהג את הצאן אחר המדבר להיצואן מן הגזל ולקחו
הקב״ה לרעות ישראל שנאמר נחית כצאן עמך ביד משה ואהרן.

»The Holy One does not give greatness unto a man until he has previously tested him in some small matter. Then he lifts him up to greatness. Behold, there are two great men of the world whom the Holy One tested in a little thing and (when) they were found faithful [and] He lifted them up to Greatness. He tested *David* with the flock, and he did not lead [the sheep] but in the wilderness in order to save them from beast of prey. For thus did Eliab say to David (1 Sam. 17^{28}) 'with whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness'. For David established the mišna: 'they do not rear small cattle in the land of Israel'. The Holy One said to him: 'thou hast been found faithful with the flock (of sheep). Go and *be a shepherd for my flock,* as it is written (Ps 78$^{(70)71}$) '(He chose David also his servant, and took him from the sheepfolds:) from following the ewes great with young he brought him (to feed Jacob his people and Israel his inheritance)'. And thus (the Scripture) says of *Moses:* (Exod. 3^{1}) 'And he led the flock to the backside of the desert' *i.e.* in order to save them from beast of prey. And the Holy One took him to be *a shepherd for Israel* as it is written (Ps 77^{20}): 'Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron.»[1]

---

[1] Notice that Moses is not the only Saviour: there are several. The point of Jn 10 is that J is *the* Shepherd and Saviour. Note also the expression 'from the beginning of their creation' and cf. above on Jn 8^{58}.

Cf. also *ExodR.* 5

וימרו אליהם ירא ה׳ עליכם וישפוט וגו׳ אמרו למשה למה אנו דומין לשה שבא הזאב ליטול אותו רץ הרועה אחריו להצילו מפי הזאב בין הרועה ובין הזאב נבקע השה כך אמרו ישראל משה מבינך לבין פרעה אנו מתים

»And they said to them: 'The fear of H' be over you and he may judge you!' etc. (Ex. 5^{6}). They said to Moses: What do we resemble? (Answer:) A sheep which the *wolf* comes to take away and the shepherd runs after it to save it from the mouth of the wolf; between the shepherd and the wolf the sheep is rent (torn asunder). Thus, said Israel: O Moses! between thee and Pharao we die (are killed).»

GenR 59^{8}

דוד רועך של ישראל שנאמר אתה תרעה את עמי (את) ישראל מי הוא רועה של דוד הקב״ה שנאמר ה׳ רועי לא אחסר

»*David* was the *shepherd of Israel,* as it is written (1 Chron 11^{2}) 'Thou shalt feed my people Israel'. Who, then, was David's shepherd? (Answer:) The Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written (Ps 23^{1}) 'The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want!»[2]

---

[1] This seems to have been a favourite theme of Rabbinic Haggada, to judge from the frequent variations of it. One of these variations is quoted and translated in two excerpts by Billerbeck, viz. ii p. 537 (the beginning) and ii p. 209 (the sequel) (from *Šem. R.* 2$_{2}$).

[2] Bornhäuser (*Das Johannesevangelium,* pp. 58, 59) thinks the background of the parabola of the 'shepherd' is (1) the simile of the Shepherd-King of

As Schlatter[1] and Fiebig[2] have pointed out, we have in the early Rabbinical literature also very close parallels to Jn 10 in

Ezechiel $37^{22\text{ ff.}}$ and (2) the Rabbinic complex of ideas as met with particularly in *Mišna*, vis. *M Šebuᶜōþ* 8 and *M Bāƀā Meṣiᶜá* 7. »Während das Bild des Hirtenkönigs aus Ezechiel stammt, ist das Material, mit dem das Verhalten des Hirten beschrieben wird deutlich einem Anschauungskomplex entnommen, den die Mischna (Schebuot VIII und Baba Mezia VII) bietet. Da treffen wir unter den vier Arten von Hütern, die es gibt, den Lohnhüter (μισθωτός נוֹשֵׂא שָׂכָר). Da wird darüber verhandelt, ob es ein Zwangsunfall ist, wenn *ein* Wolf kommt, d. h. ob der Hüter schadenersatzpflichtig ist, wenn der Wolf ein Schaf raubt, oder nicht. Da erscheint der Dieb, der stiehlt *und schlachtet,* und der Räuber, der im Gegensatz zum Dieb bewaffnet ist. Wenn der Räuber kommt, ist es ein Zwangsunfall. Der Lohnhüter kann darum nicht schadenersatzpflichtig gemacht werden, wenn ihm ein Schaf entrissen wird.

Im Gegensatz zum feigen Lohnhüter, der sogar wegläuft, wenn *ein* Wolf kommt, obwohl er ihn abzuwehren verpflichtet ist, wagt der gute Hirte für seine Schafe das Leben. Im Gegensatz zum schwachen Lohnhüter, dem der stärkere Räuber das Schaf entreisst, ist Jesus der Hirte, aus dessen Hand niemand und nichts die Schafe reissen kann.

Es ist deutlich, dass hinter den Worten des Evangelisten der in der Mischna vorliegende Anschauungskomplex als Voraussetzung liegt.»

Bornhäuser's observations are important. They may be supplemented by Schlatter's references to *Meḵiltā* and *Sifrē* (*Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten,* pp. 393 f.).

However, when Bornhäuser maintains (*ib.* p. 57) »Es darf als ausgemacht gelten, dass das Hirtenbild den König, den Messias meint, nicht etwa den Propheten», this does not hold true with regard to contemporaneous Rabbinic terminology. There is no single instance in Rabbinic literature of the epithet of 'shepherd' or 'faithful' or 'good shepherd' being applied to the Messiah. The only instance from writings nearly related to Rabbinic literature is *Ps Sol* 17^{45} (noticed by Billerbeck ii, p. 536) where, without, however, using the word 'shepherd', the writer says of the King Messiah, Son of David: '(For He is strengthened in His deeds, and is mighty in the fear of His God:) *feeding the flock* of the Lord in righteousness and in faith; and He will not suffer that any one . . . in His pasturage. (ܘܚܝܠܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܠܥܒܕܘܗܝ ܘܚܝܠܬܢ ܗܘ ܒܥ̈ܒܕܘܗܝ ܘܥܫܝܢ
ܒܕܚܠܬܗ ܕܐܠܗܗ ܪܥܐ ܠܗ ܡܪܥܝܬܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܒܟܐܢܘܬܐ ܘܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܢܫܒܘܩ ܕܐܢܫ . . .
ܗܘ . . ܒܡܪܥܝܬܗ . . .)

Strangely enough, the thought of the King-Shepherd, the *One Shepherd,* of *Ezechiel* 37^{24} is never developed nor even mentioned by Rabbinical expositors, although the verse is adduced in contexts treating of the King-Messiah. The hypothesis, then, lies near at hand, that the Rabbinical expositors were averse against applying the title of Shepherd to the Messiah, and such a fact would have to be explained only by the assumption, that some contemporary opponents were wont to use the said title of the Messenger or Messiah. The sources at hand, however, do not allow any sure deductions on the point.

---

[1] *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten,* pp. 393 f.

[2] *Die Mekhilta und das Johannesevangelium* (ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ, vol. I, pp. 57—59): »Zu Ex 15$_1$ finden sich in der Mekhilta Ausführungen, die in dem Satz gipfeln:

the thought of the 'shepherd', or the leader of Israel as having 'given his life' for Israel or for the Tora.

The Mandæan parallels have been noticed by Bultmann[1] and Bauer[2]. They are *M Joh XI* 44—51, and *GR V 2* $181^{18—21}$ (*Pet.* $177^{18—22}$). The latter may be quoted here in the original.

ולמאנדא ד̄הייא ד̄האוילכון רוחצאנא כוי ראיא טאבא ד̄ראיאלון וכאליא
ומראחיק מינאיכון כול רוה סיטיא כוי ראיא טאבא על אקנה ד̄לדיבנאיהון
דאבארלהון ומאותיבלכון ונאציבלכון לקודאמה̄

»And in Manda dHayye put your trust! As a *good shepherd (rāi̯ā ṭābā)* who feeds them (*i.e.* the sheep) he keeps away from you every spirit of defection. As a good shepherd who leads his sheep to their fold he sets and plants you before him.»

Excursus on 10^9. In order to understand the peculiar sphere of speculations, of which Jn $10^{1—18}$ takes account, it is necessary

---

Jede Sache, für die ein Mensch seine Seele gibt, wird nach seinem Namen genannt. Es wird da gesagt, dass der Tempel nicht nur »Haus Gottes», sondern auch »Haus Davids» heisse, weil David sich so sehr um ihn bemüht, »seine Seele für ihn gegeben» habe. Dann ist von Moses die Rede, der für das Gesetz, das Volk, die Rechtsbestimmungen unter Lebensgefahr eingetreten sei. Es wird da auf Ex 34; Deut 9; Ex 2 verwiesen. Besonders wichtig ist nun, dass die Mekh. zu Ex 12_1 den allgemeinen Satz aufstellt: *Du findest überall, dass die Väter und die Propheten ihre Seele für Israel hingaben,* und dabei an Jonas (1_{12}) und besonders an David erinnert. Dieser sagt 2. Sam. 24_{17}, wo vorher von der Plage des Volkes zur Strafe für die Volkszählung, die David veranstaltet hatte, die Rede ist, im Gebet zu Gott: »*Siehe, ich habe gesündigt und ich habe mich verschuldet; diese aber, die Schafe* הצאן — *was haben sie getan? Möge doch deine Hand gegen mich und mein Vaterhaus sein.*»

Für הצאן hat die LXX *τὰ πρόβατα.* Die Mekh. formuliert im Hinblick auf diese Stelle obigen Satz von der Hingabe der Seele für Israel durch die Väter und die Propheten.

Da haben wir also die Hingabe der Seele durch den guten Hirten für seine Schafe. Franz Delitzsch übersetzt das *τίθησιν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων* mit נפשו בעד צאנו יתן. Statt נתן findet sich bei dieser Redeweise in der rabbinischen Literatur auch מסר, statt נפשו auch עצמו. Gedacht ist dabei bei den Rabbinen an das Einsetzen des Lebens, die Hingabe unter Lebensgefahr. Der Hauptunterschied zwischen Jesus und den anderen »guten Hirten» des jüdischen Gedankenkreises ist dabei der, dass bei ihm diese Aussage besonderes Gewicht dadurch erhält, dass er den Tod tatsächlich erleidet, während bei Moses, Jonas, David dieses nicht in dem Sinne überliefert wird, dass ihr Eintreten für das Volk zu ihrem gewaltsamen Tode führt.»

[1] *Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen* etc., p. 116.

[2] *Joh. Ev.*^{2}, p. 139.

to dwell on the implications of Jn 10 9, and the background in contemporaneous thought for the dictum: »I am the door». Then it will be well to make the usual review of Gnostic, Mandæan and Rabbinic parallels.

Od. Sol. XVII 6 ff. This must be quoted at some length, in order to show the different connection in which the dictum is put. (Christ[1] speaks:) And all that have seen me were amazed, and I was supposed by them to be a strange person: 7. And He who knew and brought me up, is the Most High in all His perfection: and He glorified me by His kindness, and raised my thought to the height of Truth. 8. And from thence He gave me the way of His steps, and *I opened the doors that were closed:* 9. and I broke in pieces the bars of iron: But my own iron (bonds) melted and disolved before me. 10. *And nothing appeared closed to me, because I was the opening of everything.* 11. And I went towards all the bondsmen to loose them; that I might not leave any man bound . . .» (ܘܠܐ ܡܕܡ ܐܬܚܙܝ ܠܝ ܕ
ܐܚܝܕ ܡܛܠ ܕܦܬܚܐ ܕܟܠܡܕܡ ܐܢܐ ܗ̄ܘܝܬ ܘܐܙܠܬ ܠܘܬ ܟܠܗܘܢ ܐܣܝܪ̈ܝ ܠܡܫܪܝܘ܂
ܐܝܟ ܕܠܐ ܐܫܒܘܩ ܐܢܫ ܟܕ ܐܣܝܪ܂ ܘܐܣܝܪ܂)

The passage is mentioned by Bauer[2] and by Bultmann[3]. The latter[4] also points to

Od. Sol. XLII (Christ speaks:) 15. And those who had died ran towards me; and they cried and said, Son of God, have pity on us; 16. and do with us according to thy kindness; and bring us out from the bonds of darkness; 17. And open to us the door, by which we shall come out to thee for we perceive that our death does not touch thee.»

It is to be noticed that in both these passage the door is the door of the house of bondage; the door here is simply = the deliverer or the way of deliverance[5], whereas in Jn 10 9 the door is the entrance to the innermost abode of the Godhead. Hence there is almost no parallelism of thought at all between *Od. Sol. XVII, XLII,* and Jn 10^{9}. In spite of this it might be said, in justification of Bauer and Bultmann, that there is (in mystical or gnostical literature) a certain counterbalance between the figures of the 'door or doors of heaven' and the 'doors of the netherworld'. It would be entirely false, however, to say that the idea of the heavenly 'door' or 'gate' is constantly or constitutively linked up with the speculations on the gates of the lower regions. The former is the centre of a whole range of ideas with which the latter are not concerned in the least; and Jn 10^{9} is to be viewed only in relation to the former.

---

[1] so Rendel Harris. Others hold that the speaker is the believer (the saved).

[2] *Joh. Ev*², p. 139.

[3] *Die Bed. der neuerschlossenen mand. u. manisch. Quellen,* p. 135.

[4] *ib. ib.*

[5] The two passages quoted are striking instances of what mischief may be caused by quoting only a single sentence (or half a sentence) without taking into consideration the context. By adducing only the latter half of vs. 10 of *Od. Sol. XVII* and the former half of vs. 17 of *Od. Sol. XLII* the impression might be made that we meet here with an exact parallel of Jn 10^9. This is actually done by Bauer. Witness how he makes mention of *Od. Sol.* $XVII^{10}$: »Od. Salom. 17 10 sagt der Erlöste, der völlige Freiheit gewonnen hat: *die Pforte zu allen war ich geworden.*» That is all!

Of the Mandæan instances, none of those occurring in the main work, viz. the *Ginzā,* have been called attention to before

GR III 94^{7-10} (*Pet* 91^{4-6})

דירכא לׇטאביא דירכית ושאוית באבא לאלמא באבא לאלמא שאוית
ותראציבה̄ כורסיא

»I (*scil.* the Son) made a road for the good ones and put up a *gate for the world; a gate for the world* I put up and erected in it a throne.»

GR XI 264^{6-9} (*Pet* 266^{1-3})

אנא כול יום אינאי סאכיא לעוהרא דאהאי אזאלבה ולשבילא דמאנדא
דה̄ייא אתיבה̄ ומיסתכינא והאזינא באבא ד̄עשומיא עפתא

»Every day do mine eyes gaze towards the road in which my brethren walk and towards the *path by which Manda dHayye does come.* I gaze and behold *the door of heaven* being opened.»

This is a parallel both to Jn 1^{51} and to Jn 10. The door of heaven in the passage quoted is that through which the saved ones enter, and this is evidently opened by the Messenger or Son.

A very important parallel is *GR XII 4* 275^{13-22} (*Pet* 276^{24}—277^{4})

צאתית קאלא ד̄הייא באתרא סאגיא בית תושלמיא קאלא דזיוא רבא
דמאליל ודאריש בשכינתה רושמא הו רבא דמיתירשימיבה̄ הייא בשכינאתין
שותא דהייא שאמא בשכינתה ד̄הייא מישתכין תורא הו באסימא נהורא
דסאכא ליתלה

»I heard the *Voice of the Life* in the *Great Abode,* the House of Completion, the *Voice of the Great splendour* speaking and teaching in its Šᵉkinā. He is the great sign with which the Life in its Šᵉkinā is signed. He who hears the words (*lit.* speech) of the Life, is suffered to dwell in the Šᵉkinā of the Life. *He is the* delightful *Gate,* the Light without end.»

Here we seem to move in a similar sphere of thought as in Jn 10. *The Messenger is the Voice of Life and the Door;* the phraseology as a whole is Johannine.

Both Bauer[1] and Bultmann[2] among Mandæan passages make mention only of *MLi Qolastā III lxxvi* (134 9—135 3)

תישביהאן לקדימא קאדמאיא לבאר הייא רביא רישאייא דהייא קיריויא
ועתיתלה וזארזויא ושאדרויא לדאריא אנאת עתית ופתית באבא ומאכת
עהרא ודראכת דירכא ותראצת כודכא ולאפת לאופא אהיד עדא ופארואנקא
ומדאבראנא הייתלה לאבא שורבא רבא דהייא לאפתה̄ בלאופא דהייא
ובנאיתה בביניאנא רבא ד̄שרארא ואפיקתה̄ לאתרא רבא דנהורא ולדאורא
תאקנא

»Praises be to the First of the First, to the Son of the Great First, Life, whom the Life created, (and it came before him) and equipped him and sent him out into the Age. Thou camest, *openedest the Door,* madest the road even, puttest up the border-stone *and establishedest the connexion.* A Helper, Leader and Companion, thou werst for the great stem of the Life. Thou didst introduce him into communion with the Life, didst build him into the great structure of Truth and bring him out into the great Abode of Light and to the House of splendour.»

Into the centre of the symbolical, mystical use of the terms of '*Door*' or '*Gate*' in relation to Jn 10 9, we arrive, after considering the Mandæan instances, by putting side by side the *Rabbinical* passage *Mᵉk.* 13 d 14 a (quoted above pp. 138, 139) and a passage of the *Sermon of the Naassene* (acc. to Hippolytus, *Refut. V*), both basing upon O.T. passages containing the terms in question,

Mᵉk 13 d 14 a	*Sermon of the Naassenes*[3]
»Great is the faith, with which Israel believed in him who spoke and the world was, for by recompense of their believing in the	»But concerning his ascension, that is, the being born again, that he may be born spiritual, not fleshly, he says, the Scripture

---

[1] *Joh. Ev.*², p. 139.

[2] *Die Bedeut. d. neuerschl. mand. u. manich. Quellen,* p. 134.

[3] F. Legge, vol. i, p. 134.

Lord *the Holy Spirit* remained on them ... And thus it is said (Ps 31^{23}) 'The Lord preserveth the faithful ...' And similarly (Ps 118^{20}) 'This is the gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter.' What does it (the Scripture) say with reference to the men of faith? (Answer:) 'Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the faith may enter in' (Isa 26^{2}) *Through this gate all the men of faith* (technical term for the mystics, although perhaps not here) *enter.*»

speaks: 'Lift up the gates, ye rulers, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall enter in'... The same entrance and the same gate, he says, Jacob saw when journeying to Mesopotamia — for Mesopotamia, he says, is the flow of the great Ocean flowing forth from the middle part of the Perfect Man — and he wondered at the heavenly gate, saying: 'How terrible is this place! It is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of Heaven' Gen 28^{17}. Wherefore, he says, the saying of Jesus: 'I am the true gate'. Now He who says this is, he says, the Perfect Man who has been impressed above (with the image) of the Unportrayable One.»

The Naassene passage, it may be urged, allowance being made for the abstrusenesses, really gives the J-dictum of Jn 10^{9} its true connexion, in linking it up with the mystical speculations on Gen $28^{12\text{ ff.}}$, the 'Jacob's-ladder'. In fact, *Jn 10^{9} should be understood as implying the same ideas as those behind Jn 1^{51}.*. It is more than a coincidence, when the Naassene passage further places its quotation of Jn 10^{9} side by side with a reference to the 'Man who has been impressed by the celestial image', a typological expression found above[1] to have formed an integral part of the mystical speculations on the Jacob's ladder.

Hence it may be concluded: *'the heaven open' of Jn 1^{51} and the 'door' of Jn 10^{9} refer to the same spiritual reality.*

There is a further parallel between Jn 1^{51} and Jn 10^{9}, *viz.*

Jn 1^{51}	Jn 10^{9}
»Hereafter ye shall see heaven open and *the angels of God*	»I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved,

---

[1] pp. 35 ff.

ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.»

and *shall go in and out* and find pasture.»

The italicized words would seem to have nothing in common; if however the inclusiveness of J be taken into account, the parallelism becomes striking. Hence Jn 1^{51} may be used to explain the import of the expression 'shall go in and out' of Jn 10^{9}. Almost certainly this import is not *exhausted* by the natural features of the parable (the sheepfold etc.), but focusses a spiritual experience.

Some further Rabbinic instances of the uses of the term 'gate' (door) may be adduced here

TB B^e^r. 32 b (also *TB Bāƀā M^e^ṣiʿā* 59 a)

א״ר אלעזר מיום שחרב בית המקדש ננעלו שערי תפלה שנאמר גם כי אזעק ואשוע שתם תפלתי ואע״פ ששערי תפלה ננעלו שערי דמעה לא ננעלו שנאמר שמעה תפלתי יי׳ ושועתי האזינה אל דמעתי אל תחרש

»R. 'Ælʿāzār said: Since the destruction of the Temple the *gates of prayer* are shut, as it is written (Lam. 3^{8}) 'Also when I cry and shout, he shutteth out my prayer!' But let it be the gates of prayer are shut, the *gates of tears* are not shut as it is written (Ps 39^{12}) 'Hear my prayer, O Lord, and give ear unto my cry, to my tears thou wilt not be silent'».

TB Bāƀā M^e^ṣiʿā 59 a (a little further on from the above)

אמר רב חסדא כל השערים ננעלין חוץ משערי אונאה שנאמר הנה ה׳ נצב על חומת אנך ובידו אנך

«R. Ḥisda (died A. D. 309) said: all *gates* are shut except the gates of oppression, as it is written (Amos 7^{7}) 'Behold the Lord stood upon a wall made by a plumbline, with a plumbline in his hand'». (The meaning is: all gates are shut except the gates of prayer of the oppressed.[1])

These references may be supplemented by two features from early Jewish mysticism. (1) The 'little Yahu͡æ', Meṭaṭron, according to the mystical literature, has many names, among them *Piphiʾel* or *Papahiʾel* (from *papah*, open, and *pæpah*, door) explained from his function of opening the *door* through which men's prayers as

---

[1] Cf. the explanation by Raši:

הצועק על אונאת דברים אין השער ננעל בפניו

well as the spirits of the righteous may enter, in general he is said to preside 'at the door' (cf. below p. 907).[1] (2) The little Yahuæ also has 'all gates' opened to him by the Holy One.[2] No instance however is to be found, to the writer's knowledge, of a predication 'being the door' applied to Meṭaṭron. In that case of all parallels the Mandæan ones come nearest to Jn 10 9.[3]

At this point, however, another quotation from the *Sermon of the Naassene* will come in at its apposite place:

Hipp. *Refut.* v. 8$_{23-27}$:

Καὶ πάλιν, φησίν, ἐξαλοῦνται ἐκ τῶν μνημείων οἱ νεκροί, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῶν σωμάτων τῶν χοϊκῶν ἀναγεννηθέντες πνευματικοί, οὐ σαρκικοί. Αὕτη, φησίν, ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ διὰ τῆς **πύλης** γινομένη τῶν οὐρανῶν, δι' ἧς οἱ μὴ εἰσελθόντες, φησί, πάντες μένουσι νεκροί. Οἱ δὲ αὐτοί, φησί, Φρύγες τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον πάλιν ἐκ μεταβολῆς λέγουσι θεόν. Γίνεται γάρ, φησί, θεός, ὅταν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστὰς διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης **πύλης** εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Ταύτην, φησί, τὴν **πύλην** Παῦλος οἶδεν ὁ ἀπόστολος, παρανοίξας ἐν μυστηρίῳ καὶ εἰπών· ἡρπάσθαι ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου καὶ γεγονέναι ἕως δευτέρου καὶ τρίτου οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὸν παράδεισον αὐτόν, καὶ ἑωρακέναι ἃ ἑώρακε καὶ ἀκηκοέναι ῥήματα ἄρρητα ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ εἰπεῖν. Ταῦτά ἐστι, φησί, τὰ ἄρρητα ὑπὸ πάντων λεγόμενα μυστήρια, ἃ [καὶ λαλοῦμεν] οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες, ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστί, καὶ ταῦτά φησιν ἐστὶ τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἄρρητα μυστήρια, ἃ ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν μόνοι. Περὶ τούτων, φησίν, εἴρηκεν ὁ σωτήρ· οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἐὰν μή τινα ἑλκύσῃ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος. »And again, he says, 'the dead shall leap forth from their graves', that is, the spiritual man, not the fleshly, shall be born again from the bodies of the earthly. This, he says, is the resurrection which comes through *the gate of the heavens*, through which if they do not enter, all remain dead. And the same Phrygians, he says again, say that this same one is by reason of the change a god. For he becomes God when he arises from the dead and enters into heaven through the same *gate*. This gate, he says, Paul the Apostle knew, having set it ajar in mystery and declaring that he 'was caught up by an angel and came unto a second and third heaven into Paradise itself and beheld what he beheld, and heard ineffable words which it is not lawful for man to utter'. (2 Cor. 12[3,4]). These are, he says, the mysteries called ineffable by all 'which (we also speak) not in the words taught by human wisdom, but in those taught by the Spirit, comparing spiritual things with spiritual; but the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him'; and these, he says, are the ineffable mysteries of the Spirit which we alone behold. Concerning them, he says, the Saviour spake. 'No man shall come unto me, unless my heavenly Father draw some one (unto me)' Jn 6[44]».

---

[1] *Vide* Odeberg, *3 Enoch*, Transl. with Notes, pp. 173, 174.

[2] *3 Enoch* Ch 8 and ʿAsārā h^{a}rūḡē malḵuþ.

[3] In later Jewish mystical literature, Meṭaṭron is frequently called 'the ladder' (*i.e.* Jacob's ladder) or 'middle column' (*ʿammuðā d^{e} 'æmṣāʿiþā*). The significance of these epithets, however, is not very far removed from that of terms of 'door' or 'gate'. *Vide* Odeberg, *3 Enoch,* Introd. pp. 123 f.

For the expression '*go in and go out*' we shall again have recourse to Jewish mystical literature. It is then first to be recalled, that in Jewish mysticism the innermost abode of the Deity or the innermost recess of the celestial world is called 'the Seventh Hall'. In keeping with this, the *Door* κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, is the *Door of the Seventh Hall*. It might be considered fanciful to compare the 'sheepfold' of Jn 10 with the 'Seventh Hall' of Jewish mysticism, but if the interpretation of Jn 10 here advocated be correct, such a comparison would indeed be quite to the point.

Secondly, 'the little Yahu̯æ' or Meṭaṭron is both covertly and expressly pictured as *the* one whose function it is to establish the connexion between the world outside and that within the Seventh Hall. Witness *3 Enoch* 10[1 ff.]: 'All these things the Holy One, blessed be He, made for me. He made me a Throne, similar to the Throne of Glory ... and He placed it at *the door of the Seventh Hall* and seated me on it, and the herald went forth into every heaven, saying: This is Meṭaṭron, my servant. I have made him into a prince and a ruler over all ... and every angel and every prince *who has a word to speak in My (God's) presence (before me) shall go into his presence and speak to him instead.* And every command that he utters to you in My name do ye observe and fulfil!» Cf. also *3 Enoch* 16[1] and 48 C[8]. The latter runs: »I (God) set up his (Meṭaṭron's) Throne at the *door of My Hall* that he may sit and judge the heavenly household on high. And I placed every prince before him, to receive authority from him, to perform his will.»

Thirdly, there is an oft-recurrent expression of the type 'every one who goes in (goes out) before the *Šᵉkinā*' or 'through the door of the Seventh Hall'. In contexts, where this phrase occurs, it is frequently in connexion with mention being made of Meṭaṭron as the one who has control over the access to the Seventh Hall.[1]

Having now treated at length of the implication of the terms of 'Shepherd' and 'Door' we may resume the analysis of the section. The difficulties centering round the questions of the duplicity of the 'door' and the identity of the 'stranger', 'robber', 'thief' and 'hireling' will be seen to vanish as the analysis proceeds.

10^{1} ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τῶν προβάτων ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν, ἐκεῖνος κλέπτης ἐστὶν καὶ λῃστής. The reference is to one who is not intrinsically connected with the Divine Reality, and with the 'Door' to the Divine World, *i.e.* one who is severed from the Divine spiritual reality, but still wants to take possession of it, although in his own way and after his own mind. To whom does that characterization apply? Evidently to the same class of beings as those referred to *e.g.* 5^{37b-44}, *i.e.* to those who 'seek their own glory' 'who search the scriptures and imagine to have eternal life in them etc'. And if any single individual be intended, he can only be identified with the 'Father' of all those separated from the Divine Life, *i.e.* the διάβολος. Cf. ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν with ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ of 5^{43} and *vide* above p. 226.

A further point for consideration is the parallel between the epithets of 'murderer' and 'liar' of 8^{44}, there applied to the devil, and those of 'thief' and 'robber' here.

---

[1] The earliest instance is *3 En.* 18^{19}, where it is said with reference to *Sop̄ēr 'Ăšī'ēl* (a counterpart of Meṭaṭron): »and every single prince who goes out on goes in before the *Šekinā*, goes out or goes in only by his permission». A passage showing the general sphere of speculations in which the terms 'door' 'gate' occur is the following:

3 Ascension of Moses (in *3 Enoch* 15 B): Meṭaṭron, he is prince over all the princes — and he stands before Him who is greater than all the Elohim... And when Moses ascended on high, he fasted 121 fasts till the *habitations of the ḥašmal were opened to him*... Moses prayed for mercy, first for Israel and then for himself: and He who sitteth on the *Mærkāḇā, opened the windows* that are above the heads of the *Keruḇim*. And a host of 1800 advocates — and the Prince of Presence, Meṭaṭron with them — went forth to meet Moses. And they took the prayers of Israel... In that moment spoke *'Aḵap̄rī'el Yah Yehōd̄ Šeḇā'ōp̄* and said to Meṭaṭron the Prince of the Presence: »Let no prayer that he (Moses) prayeth before me return (to him) void. Hear thou his prayer and fulfil his desire whether (it be) great or small.»

It might be concluded with some probability that the 'thief' and the 'robber' is = the διάβολος with his kin.

10^{3} The 'porter', as the context stands, most naturally is = the Father.

10^{5} This is an antithetical counterpart of such dicta as 5^{44}, 8^{44}, 8^{47}. The 'stranger' here is, most probably, to be identified, even more directly than the 'robber' and 'thief' in 10^{1}, with the devil.

10^{8} 'All that ever came before me'. If the πρὸ ἐμοῦ, as is probable, is to be retained[1], J speaks of forerunners who have sought to gain access to the sheepfold or to the sheep. The forerunners cannot possibly be Moses or the Prophets, improbably the Hasmonean princes or the princes of the house of Herod (Zahn, Trench) — for these are never alluded to elsewhere in the Gospel, and the mention of them would give no spiritual lesson — nor Messianic revolutionaries (Lagrange) nor 'Pseudo-Christs' (Wellhausen). If on the other hand, the Pharisees were meant, it would have been in keeping with the style of Jn to make a direct adress: 'You are thieves and robbers' (compare the manner of addressing the 'Jews' in $8^{39\,\text{ff.}}$).[2] Otherwise this identification would seem to suit the context best, especially in view of the close unity of ch. 10 with ch. 9, where the manner of the Pharisees has been vividly pictured.[3] John, the Baptist, again cannot possibly be meant, since he was, acc. to Jn., quites as loyal as any O.T. prophet. He, indeed, was not separated from the Divine-spiritual wold ($1^{15,30}$, 5^{33}). With some reason such disciples of John could be thought of who did not observe their teacher's loyalty to J, but even this interpretation does not fit in with the context; their activity would not be a matter of the past, which 8^{b} presupposes.

---

[1] Lagarde, for instance (*Évangile selon Saint Jean*, p. 277), omits these words; the strongest of his grounds for such an omission he formulates thus: »ἦλθον est déjà difficile à concilier avec εἰσι, avec πρὸ ἐμοῦ cela est plus difficile encore: Jésus pouvait il reprocher à ceux qui étaient venus avant lui de n'être pas entrées par lui?»

This argument is so conclusive that one is tempted to treat it as a ground for retaining the πρὸ ἐμοῦ instead of omitting it: such arguments were specially apt to present themselves to an 'intelligent' copyist as a sufficient reason for making an alteration of the text in the interest of logic. The doubt of πρὸ ἐμοῦ is, however, of long standing.

[2] To argue that J speaks here to the Jews in general, not *to* but *of* the Pharisees, would obviously be beyond the point.

[3] Cf. R. H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 146: »who the 'thieves and robbers' are is not quite clear. The reference may be to the Pharisees of chapter ix, and to those who have been responsible for so emphasising ceremonialism and ecclesiasticism among the Jewish people, that they have »robbed» the nation of their power to recognise their Messiah and Saviour (*cf.* Ezek. xxiv, 1—16; Jer. xxiii, 1—4).'

The means of arriving at an idea of the approximate meaning of vs. 8 a is the realization that the passage should not be treated as an isolated utterance but should be viewed in relation to some other passages of a similar construction. As such may be considered $3^{3,5,11,13-15,27,36}$, $5^{23,37-39}$. Then it will appear, that the forerunners belong to that class of men who have falsely claimed to possess knowledge and vision of the Divine world and to be able to teach and lead others, whereas in reality they have long ago been separated from the Divine-reality, and know only of the non-spiritual things. They are the 'externalists' of chh. 5, 6, 8 etc., 'false prophets' or 'false Messiahs', it may be conceded, if only it be remembered, that the paramount interest of J is not the proclamation of himself as the true Messiah as against the false ones, but the impressing upon the hearers of the absolute independence and reality of the Divine World. Such 'thieves and robbers' were to be found, it may be held, as well among the Pharisees as in circles outside the fold of Pharisaism. In the last instance they all derive from, one might say, descend from, the arch-robber, the Διάβολος. »For the works of their father they would do.»

Why πρὸ ἐμοῦ and what does that expression imply? Negatively, it excludes all those who really belong to the spiritual world: Abraham, Moses, the Prophets. For in their case the spiritual view would have to be applied, according to which they *were not before* J: πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί (8^{58}). Positively, it signifies all those who before J's appearance on earth, had voiced claims externally similar or identical with J:s claims. Of those it could be said: they were *all* thieves and robbers.

The sheep, i. e. those actually or virtually belonging to the spiritual world (who had actualized the spiritual element within them), those who were 'of the truth' »did not hear them». They 'heard' only that voice which they recognized as coming from the Divine world, from their spiritual home.

$10^{9,10}$ »he shall be saved», *i.e.* shall *live*, shall obtain in ever increasing degree (»more abundantly») *the* Life: »he shall go in and go out», the connexion with the Head of all Life shall be continual, »and find pasture», his prayers shall be heard, he will have the words of J within himself continually as a bread of Life $(14^{10-15,21})$.

$10^{11—18}$ The indissoluble unity of love between J and the Father on one hand and J and the sheep on the other is here the *one* truth focussed. There is a danger in following up the identification of the 'thieves and robbers' with that of the hireling. The word 'hireling' here merely has a negative purpose: J is a shepherd who gives Himself wholly, his very Life, to and for his sheep, he is no hireling who is able to abandon them. The 'wolf', again, has a definite significance: it is the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (12^{31} 14^{30} 16^{11}) against whom J is the safe protector and the guardian of the sheep.

10^{16} is an instance of such passages where one particular interpretation has got a hypnotical hold of the reader. It seems impossible to explain 'this fold' otherwise than as referring to (the disciples within) Israel and 'other sheep' as referring to the Gentile Christians to-be. But this interpretation is not by incessity implied by the wordings of the verse. It merely states that there are some, whom J counts as his sheep, yet who do not now belong to the fold; further that he regards it as his mission to lead those other sheep into-hearing his voice, and thereby being incorporated into the unity of shepherd and fold which constitutes the Divine-spiritual world.

$10^{25—38}$ is the coda-section of the preceding. The parallels with the discourses of 5, 6 and 8 are easily seen. Vss 26—29 connect the section with vss 11—18. Vs 26 strangely retrospects on vs 16. There is a parallelism between ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης and ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν, which one can scarcely avoid deeming intentional. The textual variant, adding at the end of vs 26: καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν ('as I said unto you'), at least does not lessen the weight of this impression. It would seem that vs 26 wants to express that the hearers 'who are not of J's sheep' in some way yet belong to or are connected with 'the other sheep of J who are not of the fold'. There is, in fact, one feature common to both classes, *viz.* that neither as yet hear J's voice. One might venture the distinction: the hearers of vs 26 are *farther* away from ever hearing J's voice than the sheep spoken of in vs 16. The possibility of arriving at hearing him, however, seems not to be excluded in the case of the former. This is supported by vs 38, where the admonition 'believe the works etc.!' is surely not to be treated as merely rhetorical. If the allusion of vs 26 to vs 16 be accepted, it follows of course that the 'other sheep' cannot be identified with the Gentile believers.

10^{30} ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν. The dictum in all its greatness causes no astonishment at this point of the Gospel. The unity of the Father and Son are so reiteratedly set forth in various words and similes. It has also been the attempt of the present exposition from 1^{51} onwards to point to the fundamental importance of this statement of unity as the necessary condition for an understanding of any and all discursive dicta of Jn. — It will be unnecessary to enter into a discussion of the well-known investigations of Dieterich regarding the idea of the *unio mystica* between the Deity, the Father, and the Son.[1] The dictum *Corp. Herm* I 6 of the unity of Νοῦς, the Father and Λόγος, the Son, is likewise commonly known. The Mandæan literature frequently attests the idea of the spiritual unity of the Life and the Son or of the highest manifestations of the Deity by whatever names they may be called. Any influence from one or other system or 'religion' upon Jn is maintained neither by Dieterich nor by Bauer.

There is, however, one special point to be considered in connexion with Jn 10^{30}, *viz.* the question of the allusion here, as in 8^{58}, to a Divine Name. This question has been put up by Professor Box, who has called attention to the ancient, mysterious exclamation אני והו and the use of אני as a Divine Name recorded in *Pirqē 'Āḇōḇ* 1^{14}, *M Sukkā* 4_2, *TB Sukkā* 45 a, 53 a.

Pirqē 'Āḇōḇ 1^{14} and *TB Sukkā* 53 a preserve a strange dictum of R. Hillel the Elder in two different versions.

Pirqē 'Āḇōḇ 1^{14} runs:

אם אין אני לי מי לי וכשאני לעצמי מה אני ואם לא עכשו אימתי

The meaning is dark, but might perhaps be rendered thus: »If *I* (*i.e.* God) is not for me, who is for me, and when I (man) am for myself, what am I, and if not now, when?», but it may also be rendered: »If I (God) do not own myself who owns me, and I am alone, what am I and if not now, when?»[2]

---

[1] A. Dieterich-O. Weinreich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*³ pp. 68, 155 f. *Vide* further Bauer, *ad loc.* (*Joh. Ev.*² p. 141).

[2] Not to mention the current Jewish rationalized translation: »It I deal not for myself, who will do for me? And if I be for my self alone what am I able to do? And yet if not now when?» a translation that beyond all doubt misses the whole import of the sentence.

TB Sukkā 53 a

תניא אמרו עליו על הלל הזקן כשהיה שמח בשמחת בית השואבה אמר
כן אם אני כאן הכל כאן ואם איני כאן מי כאן

»There is a *Bāraiþā.* They used to tell of Hillel the Elder that when he rejoiced with the joy of the festival of [the house of] water-drawing he said thus: 'If 'I' is here, all is here, and if 'I' is not here, who is here?'»

M. Sukkā 4 2

... בכל יום מקיפין את המזבח פעם אחת ואומרין אנא ה׳ הושיע נא אנא
ה׳ הצליחה נא ר׳ יהודה אומר אני והו הושיעה נא

»Every day (of the festival of Sukkōþ) they used to go round the altar saying: 'Oh, Lord, save, Oh, Lord, deliver!' but R. Yᵉhūđā used to say: '*ᴬni u̯ᵉhū (I and he?)* do save!'»

The underlying meaning of R. Hillel's and R. Yᵉhūđā's words (which has been obscured by the Rabbinical tradition) seems to be based on the mystical belief that the Salvation was to be brought about through the union of the *Holy One* and his *Šᵉk̄inā* (his abode or presence on earth, *e.g.* in the Temple). Through men's sin the Holy One and his Šᵉkinā have been separated, (result: the Temple destroyed). R. Yᵉhūđā's dictum is easiest of explanation: »Let the union of *'I'* (= the *Šᵉk̄inā*) and *'He'* (= the *Father* in Heaven, the Holy One) bring about the Salvation!» Hillel's words again would express some inner dialectical process in the Divine mind regarding the separation of the Godhead from his earthly abode.

On the hypothesis that Jn 10^{30} is a mystical self-predicatory utterance of J of the type of אני והו it would mean: *in me (J) the Šᵉk̄inā is present, and now (in me) the Father and the Šᵉk̄inā are united, and Salvation is brought about.* (Cf. 1^{14}, 12^{28}.)

This would explain the hatred of the Jews and the accusations for blasphemy brought against J: »that thou, being a man, makest thyself God» (8^{33}).

10^{34-38}. Here the argument is taken up as if J had merely stated his sonship. Vss 34, 35 are, indeed, scarcely Johannine in character. 36—38, on the other hand, may well be accounted genuine. In view of the intimate connexion between 34, 35 and 36—38, it is safe to conclude, however, that also the former are original. On the passage *vide* Bernard *ad loc.*, on the phrase 'your Law' *vide* above, p. 292.

$11^{9,10}$ »A mystical meaning lurks behind the literal meaning of the words employed».[1] Especially is this true of the last clause: ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ. The expression is analogous with ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα; it refers to the spiritual Life in man, that which is also spoken of as ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου etc. But the specific meaning of this utterance as applied to the context is to be understood by recalling the discussion of the 'spiritual time' in ch 7: the possession of the 'Light within' implies the inclusion into the Divine 'time-order', and this may be viewed *as a constant guidance in the way instituted by that time-order. Nothing from outside, from the world of 'night', can cause the possessor of the light to fall.* For extraneous parallels *vide* below on 12^{35}.

11^{25} ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. For the idea of 'resurrection' and its relation to the thought of immortality (οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ) or passing from death to life it may suffice to refer to the excursus on 5^{24-29} above pp 209—216. The problem here is: what exactly is meant by J's *self-predication: I am the* resurrection and *the* Life. To answer the question it is only necessary to take into account (1) the intimate connexion, in the self-predication, of ἀνάστασις and ζωή. If by the word ἀνάστασις the mind is focussed on the final consummation, the word ζωή serves to underline that J's activity or being is not concerned merely with any precise external happening (such as the vivification of Lazarus regarded as a single miracle or the resurrection at *the* Last Day or the resurrection of an individual on his *Last* Day), but that in J Life is always present, He **is** (contains, unites in Him, includes, the whole spiritual Reality, the Life from its earliest beginnings to its final consummation). 'Every one who lives, and believes in me (*i. e.* who has entered through faith into J's world, acc. to $3^{14\text{ ff.}}$) he shall never die (*i. e.* he shall never experience the state of the νεκροί, the dead)', but shall pass directly at the time of death into the Divine-Spiritual Reality.[2]

---

[1] Bernard, *The Gospel acc. to St. John ICC*, ii p. 377.

[2] Bernard excellently: »Every one who is living (*sc.* in the heavenly life) and a believer in me shall never die).»

It may be observed that the Aramaic equivalent of the phrase 'I am the resurrection and the Life' most be אנא קיימתא וחייא. The expression תחיית המתים (vivification of the dead) used exclusively in Rabbinic phraseology gives no sense. For the use of the term קיימתא we have the strong support of the Mandæan sources.

The Mandæan term 'Life' as a name for the Godhead, the Son etc. is technical. In Mandæan literature it, as regards frequency of use, approximately corresponds with the 'Father' of Jn. Cf. however here *GR XIV* $291^{10\text{ f.}}$ (*Pet* $294^{16\text{ f.}}$).

אנא הייא בר הייא אנא לעבראיון אלאך שאדרון על אתרא

»I am the Life, the Son of the Life, one, His Son, He has sent to thee.»

11^{41} πάτερ exactly corresponds to the Aramaic inception אבא (frequent in Rabbinic, Jewish mystical and Mandæan sources). εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου (מברכך אנא די שמעתן). This pictures J's unity with His Father in relation to prayer. He is conscious of his prayer being internally included in the Divine will. 11^{42} even more emphasizes this eternal aspect of J's consciousness. The latter clause of this vs must, with Spitta[1], Garvie[2] and Bernard[3], be accounted an addition.

12^{23}. Links up with $7^{6\text{ f.}}$, *quo vide*. Out of the unity with His Father J is the exponent of the complete accord with the Divine-Spiritual time-order. $12^{24—27}$ Synoptic saying and Pauline[4], but put in the Johannine light of spiritual insight. 'Where I am there also my servant shall be', is a repetition of the Jn-ine emphasis of the inclusiveness of the Son of Man with regard to the believers (*vide* above on 15^{1}, $3^{5,11}$ etc.), followed by the aspect of inclusiveness in relation to the Father (cf. 5^{23}).

12^{28}. »Glorify thy name.» The understanding of this prayer demands the consideration also of the fact that J carries (one might even venture to say: *is*) the Divine Name. The father is glorified in the glorification of his Name = J. The 'glorification' is here[5] really a Jewish term. It means the establishment of God's כביד (Hebrew) or יקרא (Aramaic), being God's *heavenly Glory*, on earth in the שכינה (= Jesus, *vide* above on 8^{58} and 10^{30}). The complete unification of כבוד and שכינה will be demonstrated to all in the Passion of J., and his lifting up in the experience of the believers[1]. On the 'voice from heaven' *vide* above on 5^{37}[2].

---

[1] *Das Joh. Ev.* pp. XXXI, 250 f.

[2] *The Beloved Disciple* pp. 19, 128.

[3] *The Gospel acc. to St. John ICC* ii p. 398, 399.

[4] 1 Cor 15^{36}, Mc 8^{35}, Mt 10^{39}, Lk 9^{24}, 17^{33}.

[5] Against Dalman, *Jesus-Jeschua*, p. 195 f.

12^{31}.[3] With the 'glorification' the power of the 'Prince of the World' is set at nought, *viz.* over those who are willing to hear the Son's voice and unite with him (14^{30}). It is a judgement, *i.e.* a divisive judgement, between those who continue their adherence to the 'Satan' and thereby also continue to be under the power of the Prince of the World. (For the distinction between the Prince of the World and the Διάβολος, *vide* further *Studies in chh 13—20 of the Johannine Gospel*, on 14^{30} and 16^{11})[4]. Here the 'judgement' is conclusively seen in its consummate aspect: it is not a final contest between two powers, but a judgement on account of complete severance from or reunion with the Spiritual-Divine; hence, it has the two corresponding aspects of salvation and self-condemnation.

12^{32}. On the double significance of this dictum reference may be made to the discussion of 3^{14} above.

$12^{35,36}$. 'Sons of the Light' is an expression preserved especially in *Mandæan Literature:* בניא נהורא. The expression is used as an epithet of the inhabitants of the Divine world and frequently occurs as an apposition to '*Uthras*'. Cf. *GR III* 67^{25} (*Pet* 71^{6}), *V 5* 202^{34} (*Pet* 203^{8}), 203^{35} (*Pet* 204^{14}), *VI* 211^{12} (*Pet* 211^{22}), *IX 2* 236^{2} (*Pet* 235^{2}), *X* $246^{8 f.}$ (*Pet* 245^{19}), *GL I 2* $435^{12 f.}$ (*Pet* 16^{3} ארבא גובריא four men sons of Light, of celestial beings cf. *MLi* 24^{11}, 83^{3}), *I 4* [illegible]6^{38} (*Pet* 30^{12}), 448^{10} (*Pet* 32^{7}), 449^{1} (*Pet* 33^{15}), 450^{5} (*Pet* 35 [illegible]), 451^{6} (*Pet* 36^{16}), *II 5* $461^{4 f.}$ (*Pet* $43^{19 f.}$), *MLi Qolasta I x* 18 [illegible]*vii* 24^{11}, *xxv* 41^{1}, *II xxxviii* 71^{5}), *xlix* 84^{1}. *As an epithet of th*[illegible] *'men of proved faith', the believers,* it is used in *MLi Qola*[illegible] *I xxiii* 36^{8}. For Mandæan parallels to the general expression [illegible]alk in the Light', 'live in the Light', 'be of the Light' *vide Gl*[illegible] 252^{28}—253^{2} (*Pet* $251^{6—13}$), $255^{29—33}$ (*Pet* $255^{6—10}$), $256^{1—3}$ ([illegible] $^{15—17}$) *et passim*.

---

[1] The reading [illegible]μα, hence, is seen to be essential. Contrast Pallis, *Notes* p. 29.

[2] P. 222 f. and [illegible]te 1.

[3] On the conc[illegible] of the »Prince of the world» (Sar hā ʿOlam) im Jewish mysticism *vide* Ode[illegible] *3 Enoch* ch 30^{2} 38^{3} notes, and Schlatter, *Spr. u. H. 4 Ev.*, p. 121.

[4] Cf *GR I* 17^{8}, [illegible] 1^{40} (*Pet* 15^{2}) כאטאנא נאפלא 'the falling Satan'.

12^{44-50} contains the final summary of the doctrines of the discourses of Jn 1—12. Every single utterance occurs in some form or other in the preceding: the Unity with the Father, the Son doing the Father's work, the Light and the Darkness, the Belief, Hearing J's words, Salvation-Judgement, Eternal Life.

◆

R
621

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS2615.O3
Odeberg, Hugo The fourth gospel;
3 0645 0002 4025 5